

⇒HEBRAICA.⇒

VOL. VI.

APRIL, 1890.

No. 3.

THE PENTATEUCHAL QUESTION. II. GEN. 12:6-37:1.*

BY PROFESSOR W. HENRY GREEN,

Princeton Theological Seminary.

SECTION 6. GEN. 18:1-23:20.

A. The Divine Names.

Jehovah as the God of revelation and the God of the chosen race is the appropriate term to use of the Most High in his disclosures of himself to Abraham and his dealings with him, unless there is some special reason, as in ch. 17, for departing from it. It is particularly in place, ch. 18, where in his condescending grace he ratifies his covenant with Abraham by becoming his guest, and in the familiarity of friendship admitting him to his counsel respecting Sodom and accepting his intercession on its behalf. So it is still Jehovah, 19:1-28, who executes the purpose which he had disclosed to Abraham, purging his own land of gross offenders; see 13:13; 15:16; 18:20,21.

But the critics claim that 19:29 is P's account of the destruction of Sodom and the rescue of Lot, which instead of relating in detail as is done by J he despatches in a single sentence, using Elohim of the very same matter in regard to which J had employed Jehovah throughout. But

1. This verse is not a statement of the overthrow of Sodom, but presupposes this event as known and already narrated and proceeds to declare what took place when it occurred. The direct course of the narrative had been interrupted, vs. 27, 28, to mention Abraham's early visit to the scene of his former intercession and what he there beheld. Then in returning to his narrative the writer sums up in a

* Continued from the January number.

single sentence what he had already related and proceeds to say what further became of Lot.*

2. The reason for the change in the divine name is now apparent. The writer speaking of Lot, now and henceforth completely severed from Abraham, the ancestor of Moab and Ammon, to whom God is not Jehovah but Elohim as to all outside of the chosen race.

In ch. 20 the affair of Abimelech, king of Gerar, Elohim is the proper word and is accordingly used throughout, both in God's dealings with Abimelech, vs. 3,6,17, and in what Abraham says to him, vs. 11,13. Only in v. 18, where the writer introduces a statement of his own that this infliction was for the protection of Abraham's wife, Jehovah is introduced precisely as in the similar case 12:17.

In ch. 21:1 Jehovah has special reference to 18:10,14, as Elohim in vs. 2,4,6† to 17:10,19,21. In the narrative of the dismissal of Hagar and Ishmael, vs. 9-21, Elohim is used throughout, because they are now severed from the family of Abraham, whereas in 16:7-13, while Hagar still belonged to his family, it is the angel of Jehovah who finds her in the wilderness and sends her back to her mistress. In Abimelech's visit to Abraham he naturally speaks of Elohim, vs. 22,23, whereas in Abraham's act of worship he calls on the name of Jehovah, v. 33.

In ch. 22 it is Elohim who puts Abraham to trial by the command to offer up Isaac; it is Jehovah who stays his hand. God as supreme has a right to demand the dearest and the best; but the gracious and merciful Jehovah accepts the spiritual surrender and spares the child.

In ch. 23 Elohim occurs but once and very properly in the mouth of the children of Heth, v. 6.

The divine names are employed throughout the entire section in precise accordance with their true meaning and with biblical usage, and do not afford the shadow of a ground for suspecting different writers.

B. Critical Partition.—1. Chapter 18.

The intimate relation of this chapter to the preceding has already been exhibited. Ch. 18 is the final ratification of the covenant to which Abraham gave his adhesion in ch. 17, which acceptance by him is accordingly here presupposed. The reason for the change in the divine names has also been stated, the thought of God's almighty power ruling in ch. 17, as his gracious condescension does in ch. 18.

* Thus Gen. 2:1 recapitulates the work of the six days, ch. 1, in order to connect with it the rest of the seventh day, 2:2,3; 39:1, after the digression of ch. 38, sums up the narrative of 37:28-36 on returning to the history of Joseph; so Ex. 6:28-30 for a like reason repeats vs. 10-12; Ex. 12:51 repeats v. 41; Judg. 8:4, cf. v. 1; 21:8, cf. v. 5; 1 Kgs. 6:37, cf. v. 1.

† Cf. with v. 6 in its allusion to God's almighty intervention in contrast with natural causes, Eve's language at the birth of Seth, 4:25, with Elohim in a J section because of the implied contrast between God and man.

The critics allege, p. 254, 2 (1), that 18:9–15 is only a different account of the promise of Isaac's birth given 17:15–21. But this is obviously not the case. The one was made to Abraham, the other was for the benefit of Sarah. That they alike receive the announcement with a measure of incredulity based on the advanced age of both, that each laughs at what to the natural reason seemed so preposterous, which the writer notes with allusion to the name of Isaac, that the interval before the birth is stated in almost identical terms, but little time having elapsed between the two promises, is altogether natural and suggestive of one writer and one continuous narrative, not of two separate stories relative to the same event. The Lord promises to return to Sarah, not after the birth of her child in a visit which J is imagined to have recorded and R has not preserved, but he visited her in giving her Isaac, 21:1.

Wellhausen and Kuenen, p. 255, B. 1, regard vs. 17–19 and vs. 22b–33a as late additions. But the fact that the omission of these passages would create no evident break in the connection is no proof of interpolation, as other critics here confess. Well. says that **אָנִי**, v. 17, and **יְדַעְתִּי לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר**, v. 19, are suspicious and vs. 17–19 are allied in contents to 13:14–17 and 22:15–18, which he likewise pronounces spurious. But **אָנִי** occurs in J 24:45; 27:8,32; 28:13; 33:14; 34:30; 45:4, and an unusual construction cannot for that sole reason be summarily ejected from the text, unless no writer can use a phrase which he does not employ more than once. The resemblance of this passage to others, whose genuineness there is no good reason for suspecting, instead of discrediting it, tends rather to their mutual confirmation.

In regard to vs. 22b–33a there is not even the pretext of a diversity of diction or style. The allegation that the ideas savor of a later age is pure assumption. Abraham's awe vs. 27,30–32 is not inconsistent with the attentions shown to his divine guest, vs. 2sqq. The genuineness of the passage is besides vouched for by vs. 20,21 which are designed to prepare the way for the interview that follows; by the number "two" 19:1 which implies that one had remained behind, 18:2, and "angels" 19:1,15, cf. v. 13, indicating that they were Jehovah's messengers, not Jehovah himself. The assertion that J never uses the plural "angels" is disproved by this very passage.

2. Chapter 19.

Verse 29 is not by a different writer from the preceding and following portions of the chapter. Its intimate connection with both has already been pointed out. Dillmann claims that it contains five of P's "characteristic expressions," *Elohim, remembered* (as 8:1); *שְׁחַתָּה destroyed* (as 6:17; 9:11,15), *cities of the plain* (as 13:12), *in which Lot dwelt* (not "in one of which;" this sense is nevertheless justified by the passage to which he himself refers, 8:4, as well as by similar examples, Judg. 12:7; 1 Sam. 17:43; 2 Chron. 16:14; Job 21:32; Zech. 9:9). But in fact the dic-

tion of this verse is too closely allied to the antecedent narrative to admit of its being sundered from it: **שְׁחַת** *destroy* as 19:13; 13:10; **הַפֵּךְ** *overthrow* as vs. 21, 25; *cities of the plain* as v. 25; *in which Lot dwelt* is a plain allusion to 13:12, which the critics for this reason cut out of its connection and assign to P. But, as has been previously shown, it is indissolubly attached to the context in which it stands. That Abram continued to dwell in Canaan, while Lot dwelt elsewhere, is the very point of the whole narrative, which is further emphasized in the promise which immediately follows, 13:14-17. "God remembered" **זִיכָּר** affords a good illustration of critical methods; 30:22 is parcelled between P, E and J, though the words "and God remembered Rachel" are the only ones in the entire chapter which are attributed to P.

It has already been explained that the sole purpose of the recapitulation in v. 29 is to introduce the following section, vs. 30-38, and that for this reason Elohim is used in preference to Jehovah. At the same time Zoar, v. 30, plainly alludes to v. 23, and the mention of the daughters, vs. 15,16, implies that something further was to be related respecting them. In fact the only imaginable reason why Lot is mentioned in the history at all is that he was the ancestor of Moab and Ammon. This concluding section of the chapter is accordingly indispensable to both documents, is equally linked with both, and binds both together in a common unity.

3. Chapter 20.

The incident related in ch. 20 E bears a striking resemblance to that in 12:10-20 J. The critics assume that such an affair could occur but once and hence conclude that these can only be variant accounts of the same occurrence by two different writers. It is obvious, however, that R regarded them as distinct events, differing in time, place, and several particulars. And it is difficult to see why the original writer may not have been of the same mind, and embodied both in his narrative. There are numerous indications that this was really the case. That Abraham had concerted with Sarah to have her pass as his sister in more than one place is distinctly declared, v. 13; and the mention of such an arrangement would be unmeaning, if it had not been actually carried into effect. The brevity of the statement in v. 2 leaves the conduct of both Abraham and Abimelech unexplained, and is an implied reference to a previous narrative of the same sort, in which the motives of the actors are more fully stated. "From thence," v. 1, is an explicit reference to some locality before mentioned, which can only be "the oaks of Mamre," 18:1, J. The "south" *neghebh*, whether as a part of the country or as a point of the compass, is mentioned nowhere else in Genesis except in J, 12:9; 13:1,3,14; 24:62; 28:14. The expression "south country" **אֶרֶץ הַנֶּגֶב** occurs three times in the Hexateuch and but once beside in the whole Old Testament, viz., Gen. 24:62, J. Josh. 15:19, J, Num. 14:29 in a context where J

and E are confusedly mingled, and this verse or a part of it is assigned to E simply and avowedly because of this one expression. Both Kadesh and Shur, v. 1, are mentioned by J; 16:7,14; so is Gerar subsequently as the abode of Isaac, 26:1, who habitually repeated what his father had done. In 21:32, which is a continuation of the narrative in ch. 20 and by the same hand, Abraham is in Beersheba, just as he is in the following verse, 21:33, J, and his presence there is nowhere else explained. And v. 34, J speaks of his sojourn in the land of the Philistines. And the diction of the chapter is throughout that of J.

נָסֹעַ v. 1 is the standing expression in J for the journeying of the patriarchs, 12:9; 18:11; 33:12,17. **אֶרְנִי** v. 4, in J, 18:3,27,30-32. **מוֹת** the **הַשְׁכִים** v. 8, as in 19:2,27; 26:31. **לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה** v. 9, *ought not to be done*, as 34:7. **רָקָ** v. 11, as 6:5; 19:8; 24:8, etc. **עַל־דְּבָרָ** v. 11, as 12:17. **אָמַנָה** v. 12, only beside in Josh. 7:20. **עֲשֵׂה חֶסֶד** *shew kindness*, v. 13, as 19:19; 24:12,14,49. **שְׁפָחָה** v. 14, as 12:16; 16:2; 24:35. **אָמַת** v. 17, a less servile term, as appears from 1 Sam. 25:41, and indicative not of a different writer but of an altered shade of meaning. **אֶרְץ לְפָנֶיךָ** v. 15 as 13:9; 34:10; cf. 24:51. **הַוִּיחָדָה** v. 16, as 24:14,44 and Lev. 19:17, J (Dillmann). **אֶלְהִים** as 3:1-5; 39:9 in intercourse with those not of the chosen race, whereas when the writer speaks, v. 18, he uses **יְהֹוָה**.

The nocturnal revelation, vs. 3,6, has its parallel in J 26:24; 28:16, and in a section marked by **יְהֹוָה**, though its reference to J is arbitrarily disputed, 15:1, 12 sq. The language of Abimelech, v. 10, recalls that of Pharaoh, 12:18. Abraham's intercession, v. 17 as 18:23 sqq. "God caused me to wander," v. 13, corresponds precisely with 12:1, the injunction to go to a land not yet disclosed. There is no discrepancy between v. 12 and 11:29 (J) or 31 (P). As Abraham's wife she was Terah's daughter-in-law; the mention of the fact that she was also his daughter was purposely reserved for this place, that the difficulty might not be solved before it had arisen.

Such a close relationship as has now been exhibited proves the identity of J and the author of ch. 20, if critical arguments are of any force.

4. Chapter 21.

The opening verses give some trouble to the critics. "At the set time of which God had spoken to him," v. 2b, clearly refers to 17:21 and must therefore be by P. But **חֶרֶה**, p. 32 (8) and **זָקְנִים** in 2a are commonly reckoned characteristic of J. Hence Wellhausen lets the P paragraph begin with the end of a sentence, the beginning of which is prefixed by another hand. Kautzsch is intrepid enough to find the missing half in 1b, which he attaches to 2b, patching up a sentence from the severed fragments of two different sentences. In either case P tells that Abraham named and circumcised his child without first stating the fact of its birth. To avoid this incongruity Delitzsch and Kittell concede 2a to P notwithstanding the J words which it carries with it, though Dillmann excepts **זָקְנִים** pronouncing it a later gloss. Still v. 1 with its emphatic

repetition that God fulfilled a promise so long delayed violates critical rules. Such a repetition creates a doublet, which must be shared between distinct writers. Dillmann accordingly like Kautzsch gives 1a to J and 1b to P, though the latter has the wrong divine name, and it must be assumed that R has changed an original אלהים into יהוה with no more reason than the opposite change assumed in 17:1.

Verse 6 is not a different explanation of the name Isaac from that in 17:17 P and 18:12 J. Abraham's and Sarah's laugh of incredulity is exchanged for a laugh of joy. There is no reason why all should not be mentioned by the same writer with allusion to the name which means 'laughter.'

Verses 9–21 is not a different version of the story in 16:6–14. One was a voluntary flight from which Hagar was sent back by the angel before the birth of her child. In the other Hagar and Ishmael were authoritatively and finally dismissed with the divine approval. This is by the critics assigned to E, but there is nothing to distinguish it from J except the divine name which has been explained already.

תְּהִלָּה v. 11, as 26:32; יְרֻעַ בְּעֵינִי vs. 11,12 עַל v. 16, as Ex. 8:24; *God was with the lad*,
as 38:10; 48:17. שָׁמַע בְּקֹל v. 12, as 27:8,43. כֶּחָק v. 20, as 26:24,28; 28:15; 39:2,21; divine angel
as 19:27. הַשְׁכִּים בְּבָكָר v. 14sqq. as calling out of heaven, v. 17, as 22:15.
4:23; 32:23; 33:1sqq. נָרְשָׁה v. 16, as 3:24; 4:14.

Verses 22–32 are like the preceding attributed by the critics to E, (v. 23 refers back to 20:14,15), but are indistinguishable from J, except in the divine name, which is explained above.

God is with thee, v. 22; עֲשֵׂה חָסֵד v. 23; כָּרְתָּ בְּרִית vs. 27,32 as 26:28; Ex. 38:9; 48:3. עַל אֱדוֹת v. 25; בְּעֵבֶור הַנָּהָר v. 34:12,15,27. כָּרְתָּ בְּרִית v. 30 as 8:21; 18:29,31,32; 23 as 15:16 (J Well.). בְּלִתִּי v. 26 as 3:11; 26:24.

5. Chapter 22.

Knobel assigns 22:1–19 to J notwithstanding the alternation of divine names. Dillmann admits that there is much in the language, which reminds of him. Hupfeld (*Quellen*, p. 178), after discussing the critical division of the chapter, adds: "Nevertheless the complete and articulated whole would always be the loser thereby and the justification is consequently very doubtful. On the other hand I cannot conceal that the entire narrative seems to me to bear the stamp of the Jehovahist: and certainly one would never think of the Elohist, but for the name Elohim (prop. אלהים) which here (as in part in the history of Joseph) is not supported by the internal phenomena and embarrasses criticism."

Critics generally refer vs. 1–14 to E, but differ in opinion whether vs. 15–18 are taken from a parallel account by J or are an independent addition by R. These verses are, however, essential to the narrative and an indispensable part of it, since without them it is not brought to a fitting termination. And if they are by

J, so must the rest of the chapter be. This is particularly evident of vs. 11-14 with the thrice-repeated Jehovah and the double allusion to the name "Moriah," v. 2. "The second time," v. 15, which the critics arbitrarily erase, is an explicit reference to v. 11. The angel of Jehovah is introduced in both verses in identical terms. "Thou has not withheld thy son, thine only son," v. 11 recurs again v. 16. "Neither do thou anything," v. 12, corresponds with 40:15, J, cf. 30:31; 39:6, 9. And Elohim, v. 12, is appropriate in the phrase "fear God" even in a J connection, Deut. 25:18; Job 1:1, 8; 2:3. And that even that portion of the chapter in which Elohim dominates, cannot be discriminated from J is claimed by Knobel on the ground of its anthropomorphisms, God tests, v. 1, and thus knows, v. 12, the nocturnal revelation, v. 1, (cf. v. 3), the sacrifice, etymological allusions, vs. 8, 14, dwelling in Beersheba, v. 19, and the diction, which is that of J.

נְסָה v. 1, as Ex. 16:4; calls with the answer **נְהִנּוּ** vs. 1, 7, 11 are mostly attributed by rule to E, but Well. gives Ex. 3:4 to J. **אֶת** v. 2, as 12: 13; 18:30. **לֹךְ** v. 2, as 12:1. **אֲשֶׁר אָמַר אֱלֹהִים** v. 3, as before. **בְּקָר**

(of place) v. 5, as Ex. 2:12 J (Well.). The prophetic formula **נָאֵם יְהוָה** v. 16 does not discredit the genuineness of vs. 15-18, cf. Num. 14:28; 24:3 sq., 15 sq.

The inference, p. 265, from this narrative of the "possibility of human sacrifice" by the patriarchs is, the critics must excuse me, an atrocious misrepresentation. The lesson of the narrative is precisely the reverse, that while God put Abraham's faith and obedience to the severest test, he did not require the sacrifice of his child.

1) LANGUAGE OF P.

OLD WORDS.

- (1) **אלֹהִים** explained above.
- (2) **עָרֵץ*** 19:29.
- (3) **מִזְבֵּחַ** 21:2, as 18:14 J.
- (4) **כָּלֹل*** 21:4.
- (5) **אֶתֶּן*** 23:2, 10. Great stress is laid upon the fact that Sarah died and was buried in the land of Canaan, and that the spot was purchased by Abraham and formally deeded to him.
- (6) **אַחֲרֶיהָ** 23:4, 9, 20.

NEW WORDS.

- (1) **תוֹשֵׁב** 23:4 only besides in legal sections.

(2) **מִעֵרֶת הַמִּכְפֵּלה** 23:9, 19, only referred to elsewhere as the burial place of patriarchs and with explicit reference to this passage, 25:9; 49:30; 50:13.

(3) **כְּסֶף מַלְאָךְ** 23:9, nowhere else in Hex. and but once besides in the Bible.

(4) **עַבְרֵל** 23:16 only here.

(5) **סְבִיב** 23:17, also in E 35:5; 41:48; Ex. 7: 24; 19:12; Num. 22:4; J Num. 11:24 and JE Num. 16:34; Josh. 19:8.

(6) **שָׁנִי חַיִּים** "years of the life of"; as this phrase is only used when stating the age of a person, and all such passages are by rule referred to P, it cannot be expected in J or E.

It will be observed how little there is that is distinctive to connect ch. 23 with other P sections.

* Language of P, Section 5.

2) LANGUAGE OF J.

OLD WORDS.

- (1) *אלני מمراה explained above. (2) יודה (1) explained above. (3) ל. קראת (4) חם (5) אהל. (6) עלבן (7) נא (8) מצא חן (9) נא (10) אף (also) not found in P. (11) בעבור p. 155. (12) יספ p. 163. (13) הרה p. 155 (35). (14) ירע (euphemistic) p. 163. (16) סגר p. 154. (17) רך p. 175. (18) עתה p. 155. (19) פן p. 155. (20) תרמ (21) גדר (22) אולי (23) הבית. (24) לבתי. (25) נם does not chance to occur in P, though נם is found with other personal pronouns, see below Language of E. (28) נשא עיניהם.

NEW WORDS.

- (1) שען twice in Hex., 18:4 J; Num. 21:15 E. (2) כוחר also in E 41:32; 45:9; Ex. 34:8. (3) עמר על 18:8; 24:30 J; 41:1,17 E; Num. 14:14 R; all in Hex. (4) בעט 18:10,14; Ex. 9:18 J; Num. 23:23 E; Josh. 11:6 D; all in Hex. (5) בא בימים 18:11; 24:1 J; Josh. 13:1; 23:1, 2 D; all in Hex. (6) חורל also in E 41:49; Ex. 23:5 and P Num. 9:13. (7) ארחה twice in Hex., 18:11 J; 49:17 older writing copied by J. (8) אמן twice in Hex., 18:13 J; Num. 22:37 E. (9) שקי three times in J, 18:16; 19:28; 26:8; once in JE, Ex. 14:24; besides in Hex., Num. 21:20 doubtful; 23:28 R. (10) צעה also in E 27:34 and Dill. Ex. 3:7,9. (11) ספה destroy, three passages in Hex., 18:

3) LANGUAGE OF E.

OLD WORDS.

- (1) אנבי (2) רך, p. 175. (4) עלבן (5) גדר, p. 177. (6) השכים בברק (7) נריש, p. 154. (8) הובית, see above under ch. 20. (9) שמע בקהל, see under ch. 21. (10) על אורות do. (11) ברית ברית do.; see also p. 174. (12) פחק, p. 153. (13) שיח 21:19, nowhere

23,24; 19:15,17 J; Num. 16:28P (Nöldeke) RJ,† (Well.), JE (Dill.).

(12) חיללה 18:25; 44:7,17 J; Josh. 22:29 R; 24:16 E; all in Hex.

(13) נשא forgive, also in E 50:17; Ex. 28:21; Josh. 24:19.

(14) יאל Hiph. also in E according to Schrader Ex. 17:12.

(15) לוֹן also in E 28:11; 31:54; 32:22; Ex. 23:18.

(16) השכים repeatedly in E as well as J.

(17) משתה 19:3; 26:30 J; 21:8; 29:22; 40:20 E; all in Hex.

(18) פצר ב 19:3,8; 33:11 J, all in Hex.

(19) שלח ד also in E 22:10,12; 37:22; Ex. 3:20; 22:7,10; 24:11.

(20) לאה twice in Hex., 19:11 J; Ex. 7:18 E; derivative תלאה twice in Hex., Ex. 18:8; Num. 20:14, E.

(21) חתן in but two passages in Hex., 19:12, 14; Ex. 4:25,26 J.

(22) שחר three passages in Hex., 19:15; 32:25,27 J; Josh. 6:15 E.

(23) למה זה also in E Ex. 5:12 and according to Schrader Num. 14:41.

(24) עברך also in E 32:21; 33:5.

(25) אוֹז four times in Hex., 19:15 J; Ex. 5:13 E; Josh. 10:13 D; 17:15 J (Kayser), E (Schrader). JE (Dill.).

(26) אכם 19:34 J; 31:29,42 E, all in Hex.

WORDS FOUND NOWHERE ELSE IN HEX.

Two of those so classed do occur elsewhere, viz., (1) פת 18:5 J; also in P Lev. 2:6; 6:14; (2) בלה 18:12 J; also in E Josh. 9:13. The rest occur but once in Hex. and of course have no significance. (3) סנורים; (4) ערנה; (5) נציב; (6) קיטור; (7) אשיל.

NEW WORDS.

else in E, p. 155. (14) עליה to sacrifice, p. 175; in P Lev. 14:20, etc. (15) מובה and (16) פ (ritual law).

NEW WORDS.

(1) ארץ הנגב see above under ch. 20.

(2) אלחים explained above.

(3) חלום in J Num. 12:6 (Dill.).

* See Language of J, Section 5.

† The Redactor who combined J and E.

‡ Language of J (just preceding), new words (16).

(4) מִנְיָה + pers. pron. repeatedly in J, also in P, Ex. 6:5; 7:11; Num. 18:3,28.

(5) לְכָבֵד (for לְבָבֵד) also in J according to Dillmann Lev. 19:17; 26:36,41; Num. 15:39; Josh. 7:5.

(6) נַתֵּן לְ permit, also in J Ex. 3:19 (Well.); 12:23; Lev. 18:21 (Dill.).

(7) הַתְּפִלָּה 20:7,17; Num. 11:2; 21:7 E; all in Hex.

(8) תְּהֻהָה 20:13; 21:14; 37:15; Ex. 23:4 E; all in Hex.

(9) also in P Ex. 20:10, and according to Dill. Lev. 25:6,44 *bis*. See the critical mosaic resulting from the attempt to refer אֱמֹהָ to E and שְׁפָרָה to P or J in 29:24,29; 30:3,4,7.

(10) רַע בְּעִינֵי also in P 28:8 and in J 38:7,10; 48:17; Num. 22:34; 32:13.

(11) עַם אֱלֹהִים God was with...., see under ch. 21.

(12) חַפֵּר also in J 26:19,21,22,32.

RARE WORDS.

(1) אָמַר אֶל or אָמַר ל say concerning, 20:2, 13; no other example is adduced from the Hex.

(2) מְתֻחָוִי 20:5; (4) חַמְתָּא נְקִיּוֹן 21:14,15,19; (5) רַבָּה archer; (7) נִזְנָן נְכָר 21:23 occur nowhere else in Hex. (8) אַמְנָה 20:12 E: Josh. 7:20 J nowhere else in Bible.

When it is remembered that the paragraphs and clauses respectively attributed to P, J and E are adjusted by the critics themselves at their own free will on the basis of the hypothesis, which they are seeking to establish; and further that their present arrangement is the matured result of more than a century of learned ingenuity on the part of the most eminent scholars of Germany, the marvel is that the hypothesis still halts at so many points.

1. The attempt to establish a distinctive diction for P can scarcely be called successful. The words of the creation and flood have entirely disappeared except מִזְעֵד אֱלֹהִים and מִזְבֵּחַ. Not another characteristic word is alleged of P in this section, which is to be found prior to the life of Abraham. And those which are here ascribed to him either do not reappear in Genesis, or are found as well in J and E, with but two exceptions which contain their explanation in themselves.

2. After the preliminary portion of Genesis, chs. 1-11, but two paragraphs of any length are assigned to P, chs. 17 and 23, and a scanty show of continuity is made out by sundering verses and clauses here and there from the context in which they are found and to which they rightly belong. As only diminutive fragments of the narrative are awarded to P, it is not to be expected that these will contain the full vocabulary of the bulk of the narratives, which is shared between the other more fortunate documents. That numerous words and phrases occur in J and E, which are not to be found in P thus arises out of the very nature of the situation. A pint measure cannot equal a bushel. It is not diversity of authorship but of magnitude.

3. It is further observable that a very curious relation subsists between the two Elohists in two different though connected respects.

a. Their distribution in Genesis. They are not alike evenly distributed, but taken as a whole one succeeds the other. Before Abraham the Elohistic portion of the book is all P. After Abraham it is with insignificant exceptions all E. And a prime characteristic difference between P and E is supposed to lie in the mode

of divine revelation ; which raises the question whether the altered form of God's communications may not be due to the period and the circumstances rather than to the peculiar conceptions of the writer.

b. Their respective relation to J. P is thought to be clearly and sharply distinguishable from J. E is so closely allied to J that it is scarcely possible to draw a line of demarcation between them. Elohim occurs in certain connections from which it is inferred that the Elohistic style and diction and ideas differ materially from the Jehovistic. It occurs in other connections and with much greater frequency, where the utmost keenness of critical vision is required to discover any difference between Elohist and Jehovist whatever. The critics tell us, here are evidently two Elohists. But it is pertinent to inquire whether the apparent discrepancy may not perhaps be due to overhasty and imperfect generalization. May not the true interpretation of the facts be that a conclusion has been drawn from limited data respecting a divergence between the Elohist and Jehovist which further observation tends to nullify ?

It was shown in a former paper that the differences existing between the Elohist and Jehovist paragraphs in the ante-patriarchal portion of Genesis are not such as to imply distinct authors, but are readily explicable from the matter of these paragraphs respectively and from the special meaning and usage of the divine names Elohim and Jehovah. The same thing is yet more emphatically true of that portion of Genesis which we are now considering. The difference of diction that is here alleged between P and J is wholly factitious, being created by two features of the critical partition.

- (1) The scanty fragments of the narrative attributed to P.
- (2) The peculiar character of the only two paragraphs of any length (chs. 17 and 23), which are accorded to him.

We have already seen that the use of Elohim in ch. 17 is due to the theme and the occasion and is not suggestive of difference of authorship, and that the chapter is so closely interlaced with those that precede and follow that it cannot with any reason be divorced from them and considered an independent production. And the single occurrence of Elohim in ch. 23 (v. 6) in the mouth of the children of Heth is so entirely in accordance with general Hebrew usage that no individual peculiarity of a particular writer can be inferred from it. Moreover these two chapters severally relate to the two chief promises made to Abraham and from time to time repeated, viz., his future seed and the land of Canaan. One records the ordaining of circumcision ; the other the acquisition of the first possession in the land. Both are thoroughly germane to the entire history and give no indication of being interpolated additions. The stress laid upon each and the legal precision natural in instituting the rite and in describing the deed of purchase give to these chapters an appearance of formal repetition, which does not belong to the ordinary narrative portions of P. This peculiar material would of course

require a fitting style and diction, and sufficiently accounts for any divergence in this respect from other paragraphs.*

The great majority of the Elohistic narrative paragraphs are referred to E and are nearly or quite indistinguishable from those of J, so that, pp. 257 note, 260, the same words are freely quoted as belonging alike to J and E, and, p. 261 note, the same headings are used to indicate their style. The explanation of this resemblance offered, p. 260. 4 and note, that E "being prophetic, we may expect him to be in the main like J," obviously is of no force whatever. How would this apply to Isaiah and Ezekiel, for example, or to Hosea and Daniel? Their being prophets does not exclude the greatest possible diversity of gifts.

It is alleged, p. 261, that E is distinguished by "the following special characteristics:"

a. "The exclusive use of Elohim."

It has been shown already that the use of Elohim or Jehovah is not to be explained mechanically by the various habits of different writers, but by the appropriateness of one or the other name to the connection in which it is found.

b. "The occasional use of the plural form of the verb with the name of God."

This occurs twice, each time for a different and intelligible reason. In 20:13 Abraham uses this indefinite form of speech in addressing the heathen king, Abimelech, cf. Ex. 32:4; 1 Sam. 4:8; and in 35:7 a combined vision of God and angels is referred to. The use of this construction does not warrant the imputation cast upon the strictness of E's monotheism, p. 265; for like constructions occur in the most rigorously monotheistic contexts, e. g., Deut. 5:23(26); 2 Sam. 7:22,23; Jer. 32:36, cf. in P, Gen. 1:26 and in J, 11:7.

c. "The frequent occurrence of dreams, especially as revelations from God."

When God revealed himself to those not of the chosen race, of course Elohim and not Jehovah would be used, and the method was uniformly by dreams as the lowest style of divine communication; thus to Abimelech, 20:3,6; Laban, 31:24, the butler and baker of Pharaoh, 40:5sqq., and Pharaoh himself, 41:1sqq. So also to Jacob, when on the point of leaving Canaan for Paddan-aram, 28:12, or for Egypt, 46:2, and in Paddan-aram, 31:11, and to Joseph in his childhood, 37:5sqq. But J likewise speaks of Jehovah revealing himself to Isaac at night, 26:24, to Jacob in his sleep, 28:16, and similarly to Abram, 15:1,12,13. The futility of the critical attempts to refer these last to E and R has already been shown. The revelation to Abram, 15:1, is called a vision, a higher form of divine communication than a dream, just as that to Jacob, 46:2, is called by E. That no divine dreams are granted to Gentiles in J paragraphs is for the sufficient reason, that Elohim is necessarily used in such a connection. If God speaks directly to men

* Observe how even Wellhausen (*Comp. d. Hex.*, p. 168), in contending that Lev. 26 is by the author of chs. 17-25, insists that "the differences of language are sufficiently explained by the distinct character of the material; hitherto laws in dry style suited to the subject, now prophecy in poetic and impassioned discourse."

in J, so he does in E to Abraham, 21:12; 22:1 and to Jacob, 35:1, without its being said that it was in a dream. In P God reveals himself but twice in the entire patriarchal period, once to Abraham, Gen. 17, and once to Jacob, 35:9, in spite of the explicit mention made, Ex. 2:24; 6:3, P, that he had appeared to Isaac and covenanted with him. No variety could be expected, therefore, in the mode.

It is said, p. 265, that according to E, God "appears neither formally nor visibly, but in dreams." And yet if we may believe Dillmann, it is E who records God's wrestling with Jacob, 32:24-31. And he adds that Wellhausen's "arguments to the contrary prove nothing or rest on mere postulates."

d. "Frequent reference to angels, as God's representatives, calling down from heaven."

In one instance and one only "the angel of God" is said to have called from heaven, 21:17. "The angel of Jehovah" does the same, 22:11, 15, which but for critical legerdemain, belong to J. Angels came down to earth in E, 28:12, and meet Jacob on his way, 32:2; one spake to him in a dream, 31:11, without any suggestion of the voice coming from heaven. So far are the scriptural data from justifying the remark, p. 265, that "angels are employed; but instead of walking about on the highways, they call down from heaven."

e. "Repetition of proper names in calling."

The names of persons called are not always repeated in E, e. g., 21:17, Hagar; 22:1, Abraham; 31:11, Jacob. There are two instances of such repetition, 46:2, Jacob, Jacob; Ex. 3:4, Moses, Moses; so also the angel of Jehovah, 22:11, Abraham, Abraham, which can only be transferred from J to E by changing the text.

f. "Statements respecting three days' journey."

So Gen. 30:36, J, and Num. 33:8, P.

g. "References to the existence of strange gods in the families of the patriarchs."

As all the passages of this description are assigned to E, there are none left for the other documents. But as J records Aaron's participation in the sin of the golden calf, Ex. 32:1sqq., there seems to be no reason why he would not as readily have told of Rachel's carrying off her father's images or of the idolatry in Terah's family.

h. "The special interest exhibited in places and traditions of northern as over against southern Israel."

But if E makes mention of Mahanaim, 32:3; Shechem, 33:19 and Bethel, 28:17; 35:1, he also records Abraham's residence in the Neghebh, 20:1, and Beer-sheba, 21:31 and the sacrifice on Mount Moriah, 22:2. In ch. 14, Abraham pays tithes to the king and priest of Salem. It will serve to illustrate critical methods to state that Dillmann refers this chapter to E with the proviso that if "Salem

here really means Jerusalem," vs. 17-20 must be an interpolation, "since they could only be written by a Judean." It may be added that J, too, connects Abraham with Shechem and Bethel, 12:6,8; 13:3, and records Jehovah's appearing to Jacob at the latter place, 28:16. P, too, links Jacob with Shechem, 33:18, and Bethel, 35:15.

The "special characteristics" of E thus turn out not to be distinctive at all. No discrimination can be made between E and J in diction, style or ideas, which is not altogether arbitrary or which can be successfully maintained. The alleged doublets, incoherences and inconsistencies, by which the attempt is made to bolster up the weakness of other arguments for the original separateness of J and E, are capable of being set aside in detail. They are for the most part hypercritical cavilling, magnifying molehills into mountains and measuring ancient oriental narratives by the rules of modern occidental discourse. And the diversity which is attributed to P, grows out of the limited extent and the peculiar nature of the contents of the paragraphs attributed to him. So far as appears from the data thus far considered, the hypothesis of separate documents is unnecessary and unsustained.

6. No Inconsistencies.

1. The attempt is made, p. 254, 2 (4), to create a variance between 19:29, P, and 18:23, J, by alleging that in the former, Lot is saved for Abraham's sake, and in the latter because of his own righteous character. God's remembering Abraham and delivering Lot in consequence is a plain allusion to the intercession of the former. This misrepresentation, moreover, comes with a bad grace from those who attribute to J the shameful story of vs. 30-38, and regard it as the offspring of national antipathy which would thus attach a stigma to the ancestry of Moab and Ammon.

2. It is added that "according to J, Lot is sent away before the destruction begins, 19:22-24, but P tells us that he was sent out from the midst of the catastrophe, 19:29." This is really too trivial for sensible men. It is sufficient to ask whether Lot would not have been "in the midst of the overthrow," if God had not in a timely manner sent him forth from it.

3. The alleged "duplicates," p. 263, are followed by a statement of their "differences." These latter, instead of proving the existence of variant accounts of the same transactions, simply show that the transactions are not the same. See above under ch. 20 and 21.

4. It is said, p. 264, "ch. 20, E, cannot be reconciled by any possibility of interpretation with Sarah's age as given in 17:17, P. That which is said here of Sarah could not possibly be spoken of a woman ninety years of age." But the point that chiefly concerns us, is not what modern critics may think of the probability or possibility of what is here narrated, but whether the sacred historian

credited it. R, at least, believed it, and why not J? If it will in any measure relieve the minds of doubting critics, it may be suggested that Abimelech is not said to have been taken with Sarah's beauty. He may have thought an alliance with "a mighty prince" like Abraham desirable, even if Sarah was less attractive than formerly. And when Abraham lived to the age of 175, who can say how well a lady of 90 may have borne her years?

5. Compare 21:14-20 with 16:16; 17:24,25. "Ishmael was seventeen years of age. Now why or how should Hagar carry such a lad on her shoulder?" It is not said that she did so. "Why should he be so helpless when cast down under the bush?" Because he was faint and sick. "Why should the angel instruct the exhausted mother to lift up the boy?" Because he was not strong enough to get up by himself. After all it does not seem to be so "unnatural."

SEC. 7. GEN. 24:1—28:9.

A. The Divine Names.

Jehovah as the God of Abraham guided his servant in his search for a wife for Isaac, ch. 24, so that even Laban and Bethuel recognize the hand of Jehovah in the whole affair, vs. 50,51, and address the servant as "blessed of Jehovah," v. 31. In 25:11 "after the death of Abraham, Elohim blessed his son Isaac," Jehovah as the guardian and benefactor of the chosen race would certainly have been appropriate. And yet Elohim is appropriate likewise as suggestive of the general divine beneficence, which bestowed upon Isaac abundant external prosperity. For the same reason Isaac, in pronouncing his blessing upon Jacob, 27:27,28, first compares him to a "field which Jehovah hath blessed," and then proceeds in the very next sentence "God give thee of the dew of heaven and of the fatness of the earth and plenty of corn and wine." Here the critics are obliged in the most unnatural manner to sunder closely connected words of Isaac and parcel them between different documents. The introduction of Elohim in these passages is precisely on a par with its being associated with the birth of Seth, 4:25, in the midst of what the critics recognize as a Jehovah paragraph. In recording the history of Isaac, Jehovah is the name constantly used, 25:20,21, ch. 26, to such an extent indeed that even the Philistine king, Abimelech, perceived, vs. 28,29, that Jehovah was with him and pronounces him blessed of Jehovah. There is no deviation here from general biblical usage. While Elohim is ordinarily employed when Gentiles speak or are spoken to, as e. g., in the parallel passage, 21:22,23, they also upon occasion use the name Jehovah when speaking distinctively of the God of Israel. Thus Jethro, Ex. 18:10,11 (yet see vs. 1,12); Balaam, Num. 22:8,13,19 (yet see vs. 9,20), Achish, king of the Philistines, 1 Sam. 29:6; Hiram, king of Tyre, 1 Kgs. 5:21(7); the queen of Sheba, 1 Kgs. 10:9. In Isaac's charge to Jacob, 28:3,4, as he sent him to Paddan-aram he uses El Shaddai and Elohim,

THE PENTATEUCHAL QUESTION.

175

because he has in mind God's solemn engagement with Abraham in ch. 17, whose very words he adopts.

B. The Critical Partition.—I. Chapter 24.

Ch. 25:20 P alludes to Isaac's marriage to Rebekah, daughter of Bethuel and sister of Laban in a manner implying previous mention of these parties and of this event. Precisely the account thus called for is to be found in ch. 24 and the preliminary genealogy, 22:20-24, which, however, the critics assign to J. This makes it necessary for them to assume that a similar narrative was contained in P, but R has thought proper to omit it.

J has Aram-naharaim (once only), 24:10, while P has Paddan-aram, 25:20 and elsewhere; but apart from the fact that these names may not be precise equivalents, as Dillmann admits, this is no more a reason for suspecting diversity of authorship than when J uses two different designations of the same place,* 24:10, 'city of Nahor,' and 27:43, 'Haran,' or uses שבועה for *oath*, 24:8, but אלה, v. 41. Nor can any significance be attached to the circumstance that J says "daughters of the Canaanites," 24:3,37, and P, "daughters of Canaan," 28:1,6,8; 36:2, inasmuch as J himself varies the expression again, 34:1, to "daughters of the land."

Verse 67 alludes to Sarah's death recorded in ch. 23 P. But as on critical principles one document cannot refer to what is contained in another, Dillmann erases the mention of Sarah here as a later gloss. Wellhausen more bravely still proposes to substitute "father" for "mother" as the last word of v. 67. Abraham must have died before the servant's return, only R has omitted the account of his death. And thus by the simple device of reconstructing the text a twofold advantage is gained. A troublesome allusion is escaped and a flat contradiction created between J and P, for according to the latter, 25:7,20, Abraham lived thirty-five years after Isaac's marriage.

In v. 61 Knobel fancies that the second clause does not naturally follow the first, and that this indicates two blended accounts. And as the servant brings Rebekah not to Abraham who had sent him but to Isaac, and calls Isaac his master, v. 65, instead of his master's son, vs. 44,48,51, the inference is drawn that in the older narrative, of which there is a fragment in vs. 61-67, it was Isaac, not Abraham, who deputed the servant upon his errand. And this discovery is corroborated by some "very peculiar expressions" in these verses, of which other critics who have no end to be answered by them take no note.

Dillmann scents a doublet in v. 29b, cf. 30b, but as he can make no use of it, he lets it pass. These verses simply illustrate the inartificial style of Hebrew

* It would argue no diversity of writers if, in an account of the landing of the pilgrims, we should read upon one page that they reached the coast of America and on the next that they disembarked in New England. In the first mention of the region the more general term Aram-naharaim is employed, but ever after Paddan-aram as indicating more precisely where Haran lay: and Haran occurs in P as well as in J and E.

narrative. The general statement is made first, 29b, fuller details are added afterwards, v. 30. Or one aspect of a transaction is stated first and then followed by another; first, 61a, what Rebekah did, then 61b, what the servant did. Such seeming repetitions abound in the historical writings of the Old Testament. And they furnish the occasion, of which the critics avail themselves to construct their imaginary duplicate narratives. The general summary is set over against the detailed particulars, or one partial statement over against the other as though each had an independent origin.

The repetitions of the chapter should also be noted, in which J seems to be trenching on the prerogative of P; vs. 37-41 repeat vs. 3-8 almost *verbatim*: cf. also vs. 42-44 with vs. 12-14; vs. 45,46 with vs. 15-20, vs. 47,48 with vs. 28-27.

2. Chapter 25.

The critics are not agreed whether the opening verses of this chapter belong to P, J or E. Astruc was at least consistent in referring all genealogies of nations and tribes outside of the chosen race to a document or documents distinct from P and J. Nöldeke is equally consistent in ascribing all the genealogies in Genesis to P, and finding some remarkable numerical correspondences, which tend to confirm his view. But the consistency of referring Keturah's descendants to one document (J or E) and Ishmael's to another (P), though their territorial home is described together, v. 18, is not very obvious.

The supplementary critics, who conceive of J as enlarging P by additions of his own, had no difficulty in letting P have 25:5, though 24:36b was J's. But if J is an independent document, the identity of the verses makes it necessary to attribute both to the same source, and 25:5 must belong to J. This statement that Abraham gave all he had to Isaac would seem to carry with it the counter statement of what became of his other children. So Dillmann still argued in the fourth edition of his *Genesis*, and so referred v. 6 to J likewise. And if J spoke as in this verse of Abraham's "concubines" he must have given an account of Keturah as well as of Hagar and accordingly have been the author of vs. 1-4. But on the other hand v. 1 calls her "a wife" and v. 6 "a concubine"; so to prevent this imaginary conflict v. 6 is given to R and vs. 1-4 to E, though why he should be so interested in this particular genealogy, when he gives no other, is not clear. V. 11 is of necessity assigned to P, but its last clause contains a direct reference to 24:62 J; so that it must be clipped off and given to J likewise. V. 18 contains an allusion to 16:12 J, hence the offending clause must be excised or the verse transferred to another context and attached to J. And thus the whole passage is chopped into bits and parcelled among the several documents and the Redactor, though consistent and continuous throughout, and plainly recorded as the fulfilment of the promise to Abraham, 17:4,5 P, that he should be a father of many nations, as v. 16 to accomplish 17:20. But if P were allowed to have vs.

1–6, an opportunity would be missed of creating an apparent divergence by inferring from v. 9 what is not in it, that Ishmael continued to live with his father to the time of his death, contrary to 21:14.

Out of the remainder of the chapter, vs. 19–34, only vs. 19,20 and the last clause of v. 26 are given to P. He accordingly tells how old Isaac was when he was married, and how old he was when “they were born,” presumably his children, though this is not said, and there is no direct mention of their birth such as it is here implied had been made. P then springs at once to Esau’s marriage at forty years of age, 26:24 sq., and Jacob’s being sent to Paddan-aram for a wife, 28:1 sqq.; where these names, Jacob and Esau, appear in P for the first time. Wellhausen may well call this a “skeleton account.” And it is suitably characterized, p. 267, as “cold and lifeless, nothing but a register of deaths, births and marriages.” Is this P’s fault or that of the critics?

But after P’s portion is subtracted the critics still find the remainder not a unit. For אֶדְמוֹנִי red, v. 25, suggests a different explanation of Edom from that given v. 30; and in v. 26 Jacob is explained differently from 27:36 J. The only alternative, therefore, is to give 25,26a to E, “fragments” as they are, p. 273, or to own with Wellhausen that “J and E are so involved here that a clear separation is not to be thought of.” This unavailing trouble the critics impose upon themselves by their notion that different allusions to the significance of names are mutually exclusive, which they manifestly are not.

3. Chapter 26.

This chapter (except vs. 34,35 P) is in the main assigned to J, but unfilled gaps are thus created in both the other documents. We look in vain in P for a divine grant of the land to Isaac, such as is referred to 35:12 P, or for a covenant of God with him mentioned Ex. 2:24 P, or for God appearing to him as he is declared to have done, Ex. 6:3* P. These are all to be found in the chapter before us, but nowhere else. These passages in P must, therefore, refer to what is contained in J, which is contrary to the hypothesis, or it must be assumed here again that P had just such an account as we find in J, but R has omitted it. So when E, 46:1, speaks of Jacob coming to Beersheba and there offering sacrifices to the God of his father Isaac, there is a plain allusion to the altar, which Isaac had built there, 26:25. When Jacob left his father’s house for Haran, he went out from Beersheba, 28:10 E, implying Isaac’s residence there, as stated 26:25, but nowhere in E. Either E alludes to J or he must have related the same that is in J and R has not preserved it.

When we thus find throughout the Book of Genesis the different documents tied together by cross references, does not the critical hypothesis require too many

* Jehovah’s revelation of himself, 26:24, as the God of Abraham contains a specific allusion to 17:1 and was so understood by Isaac, 28:3.

auxiliary hypotheses for its support? It asks us in every instance to assume that the reference is not to the passage which is plainly written before us, and to which it exactly corresponds, but to certain hypothetical passages, which may once have existed, but of which there is no other evidence than that the exigencies of the hypothesis demand it.

A doublet is suspected in vs. 1-6. It is said that 2b is incompatible with 1c and 3a. Accordingly 1a, 2b, 6 are assigned to E, thus: "and there was a famine in the land; and (God) said (to Isaac). Go not down into Egypt; dwell in the land which I shall tell thee of, and Isaac dwelt in Gerar." Then 1c, 2a, 3a are given to J, thus: "And Isaac went unto Abimelech, king of the Philistines unto Gerar. And Jehovah appeared unto him and said, Sojourn in this land and I will be with thee, and will bless thee." But the fact that by ingenious slicing and piecing two seemingly complete paragraphs can be constructed out of one does not prove that the latter is of duplicate origin. The apparent lack of continuity which gives offence to the critics in these verses is of precisely the same nature as that in 24:29, 30 before explained. In 26:1 the mention of the famine is immediately followed by the statement that Isaac went to Gerar to escape it. It is then added with more particularity how he came to make his abode in Gerar instead of passing on to Egypt after the example of his father in similar circumstances, 12:19, and according to his own original intention. Jehovah directed him to dwell in the land that he should tell him of, which was immediately explained to be the land in which he then was. The explicit allusion to the "first famine that was in the days of Abraham," 1b, is without the slightest reason referred to R. Vs. 3b-5 is also expunged as a later addition to the text

1st. In order to get rid of its testimony in favor of 22:15-18, which the critics attribute to R, because if here referred to and cited by J it must be genuine and original.

2d. Because the legal phrases in v. 5 are inappropriate to the times of the patriarchs.

But (1) this verse is in exact accord with others which show great solicitude to make it clear, that Abraham and his seed were chosen of Jehovah not to be his favorites irrespective of character, but to found a pious, God-fearing, obedient race, 17:1, 2; 18:19.

(2) Abraham was commanded to leave his country, to perform specified rites in the transaction of the covenant, to institute circumcision, to offer up Isaac. He was required to exercise faith in God's promises in spite of long delays and discouraging circumstances. He observed sacrificial worship and called on the name of the Lord. The direction to walk before God and be perfect 17:1; 24:40, and his recognition of the divine justice in dealing with the righteous and the wicked, 18:23, imply his possession of a standard of rectitude. So that

though Abraham may have had no formal code, it is not inappropriate to speak of "commandments, statutes and laws" which he had obeyed.

(3) The heaping together of these various terms is certainly suggestive of the Mosaic legislation, cf. Ex. 15:26; 16:28, etc. And what is more natural than that the great legislator, who in recording the history of their ancestors had prominent regard to the instruction of his contemporaries, should commend the obedience of Abraham in terms which would make it a fit model for themselves?

Isaac's life was to such an extent an imitation of his father's, that no surprise need be felt at his even copying his faults and pretending that his wife was his sister, vs. 7-11. A stratagem, that has proved successful once, is very likely to be tried again.

Nor does it create any special difficulty in respect to the recorded visit of Abimelech and Phicol to Isaac at Beersheba, vs. 26-31, that a king and general of the same name had covenanted at the same place with Abraham, 21:22-32. That successive Philistine kings should bear the name Abimelech is no more strange than the Pharaohs of Egypt or the Cæsars of Rome, or two Napoleons emperors of France, or two presidents of the United States named John Adams. Phicol may for aught that any one knows have been an official title or he may have been the namesake of his predecessor. That the name Beersheba should be reimposed on this occasion, v. 33, is not strange. That the writer regarded it not as a new appellation, but as fresh sanction given to one already in existence, is plain from his use of it, v. 23, and it is in precise accordance with the general statements, vs. 15,18. These verses are interpolations by R in the opinion of the critics for the reason (which others may not deem conclusive) that J cannot be supposed to have referred to what is recorded in E.

4. Chap. 27:1-28:9.

Chapter 27 is a puzzle to the critics. They think that they find several doublets, and that the text is therefore composite, made up of J and E; but they are not able to disentangle them so as to separate the two accounts or even to discover any points of difference between them. It is claimed, p. 274, that vs. 24-27a repeats vs. 21-23; that v. 24 instead of progressing from v. 23 goes back to v. 21, and v. 23 is as far advanced as 27a, each ending "and he blessed him." But this is precisely like other examples before reviewed. The ultimate result is first summarily stated, 23b; then further particulars are added, vs. 24-27a, which led up to this result. The alleged doublets are mutually supplementary. They are certainly not mutually exclusive. The blind old patriarch, doubtful of his son's identity, insists upon feeling him, vs. 21-23, and obliges him to say whether he is really Esau, v. 24. Then after partaking of what had been brought him, he asks as a final test to kiss him that he may smell the odor of his raiment, v. 27. There is in all this no repetition, but a steady, onward progress to the final issue.

It is further said that 30b repeats 30a, but it yet more exactly defines it; that vs. 35–38 repeat vs. 33,34, but the only repetition is Esau's importunate entreaty; 44b is repeated in 45a, but only because this was the thing uppermost in Rebekah's thoughts.

Some have proposed to give the whole of ch. 27 to one of these documents and 25:29–34 to the other. But Wellhausen insists that it is necessary to find both P and E in ch. 27, because subsequent portions of each of these documents alike imply the narrative here given. He is unable, however, to say which predominates in the chapter; and the connection is too intricate to admit of division. But in any event, both imply the statements in 25:23,27,28, and both alike represent Jacob as fraudulently obtaining his father's blessing and thus exciting Esau's deadly hatred. Here an attempt is made to establish a difference between J and E on the one hand, and P on the other, as to the reason why Jacob went to Paddan-aram. According to the former it is to flee from his enraged brother; according to the latter, 28:1–9, that he may not marry among the Canaanites, as Esau had done, but obtain a wife from among his kindred. P knows of no hostility between the brothers, p. 267. But all this is spoiled by the statement in v. 7, that "Jacob obeyed his father and his mother, and was gone to Paddan-aram." His father sent him to get a wife, 28:1–9; but his mother, 27:42–45, to escape Esau's fury, and there is no incompatibility between these two objects. There is nothing for the critics to do, therefore, but to pronounce the unwelcome words "and his mother" an interpolation. Let them adjust the text to their mind, and they will have no difficulty in proving whatever they please.

But tinkering the text in a single passage will not relieve them in the present instance. The hostility of Esau is embedded in the entire narrative and cannot be sundered from it. Why did Jacob go alone and unattended in quest of a wife, without the retinue or the costly presents for his bride, befitting his rank and wealth? When Abraham desired a wife for Isaac, he sent a princely embassy to woo Rebekah and conduct her to her future home. Why was Jacob's suit so differently managed? And why did Jacob remain away from his parents and his home, and from the land sacred as the gift of God for so many long years, till his twelve sons were born, 35:26, P. This is wholly unaccounted for except by the deadly hostility of Esau. Even the fragmentary notices accorded to P of the sojourn in Paddan-aram thus imply that Jacob had grievously offended Esau; so that here again P either refers to what J and E alone recorded, or else had given a similar account of the fraud perpetrated by Jacob, which R has not retained.

1) LANGUAGE OF P.

OLD WORDS.

- | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| (1) מְעֵרֶת הַמִּכְבָּלָה * | (2) נָעוֹ * | (3) שְׁנִי חֵי * | (4) תּוֹלְדָה * | (5) הַולִּיד * | (6) שְׂדֵי * | (7) פְּרָה * | (8) רְכָבָה * | (9) אֲלָל * | (10) יָלֵד * |
|-----------------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|

* Section 6, Language of P.

ארץ מנירן always P. It first occurs 17:8 in the promise to Abraham, and four times besides with explicit reference to that passage, 28:4; 36:7; 37:1; Ex. 6:4; and without מנירם without P.

† Section 5, Language of P.

in one place besides, 47:9 also P. The corresponding verb **וָיַגֵּן** is, however, used of the sojournings of the patriarchs alike in each of the so-called documents, P, 35:27; Ex. 6:3; J, Gen. 21:34; 26:3; E, 20:1; 21:23. (10) **אֲלֹהִים** before explained.

As in this and the following sections of Genesis all but a few verses is divided between J and E, it is not surprising that they have nearly all the words and P comparatively few. This is the secret of their "broad vocabularies," p. 257.

2) LANGUAGE OF J.

OLD WORDS.

- (1) **הָהּוּ*** (2) **בְּאָבִים** (3) **שׁוֹם** P, Gen. 6:16, p. 154. (4) **נֶגֶן**† (5) **אוֹרֶז** וּמָולֶת, p. 177. (6) **אָנְכִי**, p. 174 (under 6:17). (7) **טרם**, p. 156. (8) **יְדֻעַ** euphemistic, p. 163. (9) **אָוְלִי**‡ (10) **פָּנִים** p. 155. (11) **רָקָךְ**, p. 175. (12) **לְקָרְאָת** (13) **לְלִין*** (14) **הָכִיחָה** (15) **בְּחוּץ** (16) **עַמְּדָעַל** see under ch. 20. (17) **נְשָׂא עִזִּים** (18) **מָהָרָה**. (19) **אָהָל**, p. 163. (20) **לִידָּה** (with father), p. 163. (21) **וְזַהֲרָה** (22) **שְׁקָרָה*** (23) **מְסֻחָה** (24) **בְּעָבָר**, p. 155. (25) **מְסֻחָה**, p. 175. (26) **כְּרָתָה בְּרִית**, p. 174 (6:18). (27) **אַתָּה**, p. 155. (28) **הַשְׁכִּים בְּכָקָר** (29) **עַלְכָּן** (30) **אָנָּק** also in P, Gen. 9:4,5; 23:13; 34:15,22,23, etc. (32) **גַּם** + pers. pron.‡ (33) **צְעַקָּה**,* (34) **מִקְנָה**† (35) **עַפְרָה** also in P, Ex. 8:12,13; Lev. 14:41,42,45; 17:13; Num. 5:17; 19:17. (36) **הַפְּרָה**#

NEW WORDS.

- (1) **J, Gen. 24:16; Ex. 10:28; 34:12; E, Gen. 31:24,29; Ex. 19:12.**
 (2) **J, Gen. 9:23; 24:15,45; 49:15; Ex. 12:34; E, Gen. 21:14; Josh. 4:5 and in different sense, Gen. 48:22.**

RARE WORDS.

These have of course no significance.

- (1) **הַקְרָה** also in P, Num. 35:11. (2) **מִכְאָה** (3) **מִגְדָּלָה** (4) **מִשְׁתָּאהָ** (5) **מִגְדָּנוֹת** (6) **לְהַלְלוֹה** J, 24:65; E, 37:29. (7) **עַיִף** J, 24:65; 38:14,19. (8) **לְהַלְעֵט** J, 25:29,30. (9) **שְׁעָרִים** (10) **בְּמִרְמָה** (11) **סְתִּים** (12) **עַדְךָה** only in R, 26:15,18; (13) **עַדְעַשְׁךָ** (14) **מִתְעַמִּים** in one pas-

NEW WORDS.

- (1) **הַאֲסָפָה אֶל עַצְיִן** always P. (2) **אַחֲרִי מִות** 5 times in Hex., 3 times P, once D, once R.
 (3) **אֱלֹהָה שְׁמוֹת** always P. (4) **P, פָּדוֹן אֲרָם** P, 25:20; 28:2,5,6,7; 31:18; 33:18; 35:9,26; 46:15.

- (3) **תְּבִתָּה מִרְאָה** but twice in Hex., J, 24:16; 26:7.
 (4) **J, 24:21,40,42,56; 39:3,23; E, 39:2; D, Josh. 1:8.**
 (5) **J, 24:12,14,49; 32:11; 39:21; 47:29; Ex. 34:6,7; Josh. 2:12,14; E Gen. 20:13; 21:23; 40:14; JE, Ex. 20:6.**
 (6) **J, 24:27,49; 32:11; 47:29; Ex. 34:6; Josh. 2:14.**
 (7) **קָרְדָּה הַשְׁתָּחוֹה** 7 times in Hex., all J.
 (8) **עַתָּר** 8 times in Hex., all J.
 (9) **J, 25:23; E, 27:29 all in Hex.**
 (10) **J, 26:27; Ex. 2:18; E, Gen. 40:7; Ex. 1:18; 3:8; 5:14; 18:14; JE, Josh. 17:14.**
 (11) **J, 35:17,20,23; Ex. 23:19; 34:36; JE, Gen. 27:9,16.**
 (12) **E, 27:12,22; 31:34,37; Ex. 10:21 all in Hex. except once in Deut.**
 (13) **תִּירְשָׁה JE, 27:28,37; P, Num. 18:12, all in Hex. except in Deut.**
 (14) **J, 27:41; 49:23; E, 50:15, all in Hex.**
 (15) **J, Gen. 27:45; Lev. 26:22; E, Gen. 31:38; 42:36; 48:14; Ex. 28:26.**
 (16) **הַהָּ** used adverbially only in J and E.
 (17) **אַחֲרָה** (verb) J, 24:56; 32:5; 34:19; E, Ex. 22:28 in all Hex. except Deut.

- (18) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** sage only. (19) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (20) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (21) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (22) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (23) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (24) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (25) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (26) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (27) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (28) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (29) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (30) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (31) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (32) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (33) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (34) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (35) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (36) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (37) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (38) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (39) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (40) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (41) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (42) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (43) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (44) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (45) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (46) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (47) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (48) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (49) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (50) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (51) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (52) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (53) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (54) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (55) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (56) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (57) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (58) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (59) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (60) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (61) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (62) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (63) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (64) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (65) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (66) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (67) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (68) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (69) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (70) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (71) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (72) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (73) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (74) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (75) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (76) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (77) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (78) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (79) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (80) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (81) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (82) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (83) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (84) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (85) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (86) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (87) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (88) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (89) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (90) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (91) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (92) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (93) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (94) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (95) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (96) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (97) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (98) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (99) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (100) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (101) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (102) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (103) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (104) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (105) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (106) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (107) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (108) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (109) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (110) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (111) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (112) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (113) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (114) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (115) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (116) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (117) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (118) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (119) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (120) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (121) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (122) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (123) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (124) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (125) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (126) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (127) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (128) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (129) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (130) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (131) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (132) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (133) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (134) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (135) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (136) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (137) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (138) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (139) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (140) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (141) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (142) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (143) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (144) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (145) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (146) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (147) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (148) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (149) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (150) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (151) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (152) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (153) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (154) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (155) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (156) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (157) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (158) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (159) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (160) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (161) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (162) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (163) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (164) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (165) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (166) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (167) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (168) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (169) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (170) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (171) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (172) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (173) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (174) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (175) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (176) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (177) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (178) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (179) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (180) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (181) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (182) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (183) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (184) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (185) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (186) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (187) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (188) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (189) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (190) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (191) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (192) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (193) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (194) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (195) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (196) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (197) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (198) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (199) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (200) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (201) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (202) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (203) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (204) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (205) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (206) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (207) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (208) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (209) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (210) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (211) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (212) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (213) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (214) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (215) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (216) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (217) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (218) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (219) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (220) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (221) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (222) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (223) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (224) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (225) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (226) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (227) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (228) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (229) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (230) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (231) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (232) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (233) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (234) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (235) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (236) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (237) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (238) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (239) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (240) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (241) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (242) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (243) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (244) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (245) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (246) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (247) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (248) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (249) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (250) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (251) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (252) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (253) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (254) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (255) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (256) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (257) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (258) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (259) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (260) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (261) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (262) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (263) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (264) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (265) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (266) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (267) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (268) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (269) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (270) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (271) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (272) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (273) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (274) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (275) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (276) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (277) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (278) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (279) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (280) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (281) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (282) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (283) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (284) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (285) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (286) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (287) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (288) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (289) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (290) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (291) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (292) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (293) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (294) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (295) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (296) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (297) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (298) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (299) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (300) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (301) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (302) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (303) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (304) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (305) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (306) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (307) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (308) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (309) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (310) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (311) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (312) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (313) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (314) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (315) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (316) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (317) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (318) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (319) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (320) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (321) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (322) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (323) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (324) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (325) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (326) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (327) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (328) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (329) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (330) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (331) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (332) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (333) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (334) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (335) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (336) **מִתְעַתְּעָה** (337)

SEC. 8. GEN. 28:10-33:17.

A. The Divine Names.

Two things are here observable, and have often been remarked, that in this portion of Genesis and on to the close of the book (1) the names of God occur less frequently than before; (2) Elohim largely predominates over Jehovah. Various explanations have been offered of these facts, such as the following:

- a. Jacob was on a lower plane religiously than Abraham and Isaac.
- b. His life was largely spent away from the holy land and among those not of the chosen race.
- c. Since the relation of Jehovah to the patriarchs had been sufficiently established by the previous use of that name, it seemed less important to continue to repeat it and of more consequence to guard against the notion that the God of the patriarchs was a mere tribal deity by recurring to the general term Elohim suggestive of his relation to the world at large.
- d. The fuller revelation of God as Jehovah in the Mosaic age threw that made to the patriarchs comparatively into the shade; so that while in the beginning in contrast with the times before Abraham the patriarchal age was marked by new manifestations of Jehovah, those granted toward its close seemed of inferior grade in comparison with the more resplendent revelations that were to come after and so more fitly associated with the general term Elohim than the personal name Jehovah.
- e. The solution of the critics is that the materials are henceforth largely drawn from the document E.

We are not now concerned with the question what weight, if any, is attributable to the preceding suggestions, further than to say that the critical solution does not meet the case. If the alternation of Elohim and Jehovah is not in every instance regulated in as marked and conspicuous a manner as heretofore by the meanings of the names, there is nevertheless nothing counter to the general usage of the rest of Scripture in their employment, or that suggests the idea that it was mechanically determined by the particular document from which any given extract chanced to be drawn. In many cases either name would be appropriate, and it is at the option of the writer to use one or the other. And it is no valid ground of objection to the unity of Genesis, if a like freedom prevails there as in other books of the Bible, where it might often be difficult to assign a definite reason for the occurrence of Elohim rather than Jehovah or *vice versa*.

In Jacob's dream Jehovah appeared to him, 28:13,16, but the angels, v. 12, are called not "angels of Jehovah," which never occurs in the Pentateuch, but "angels of God," as 32:2, who are thus distinguished from messengers of men, the Hebrew word for "angel" properly meaning "messenger." This does not mark a distinction between the documents as though J knew of but one angel, "the

angel of Jehovah," while E speaks of "angels": for J has "angels" in the plural, 19:1,15. The place, where Jehovah had thus revealed himself, Jacob calls "the house of God" and "the gate of heaven," God in contrast with man, as heaven with earth. It was a spot marked by a divine manifestation. The critical severance will not answer here; for, if vs. 13-16 be excised as belonging to J, the vision of angels, v. 12, alone would not entitle it to be called the house of God, v. 17.

In Jacob's vow, vs. 20,22, the specifications respect God's general providential care, and hence he uses Elohim, while nevertheless in a manner perplexing to the critics, who find themselves obliged to erase the offending clause, he recognizes Jehovah as the God, v. 21, to whom he makes his appeal and gives his pledge.

The birth of Jacob's children is capable of being viewed in a twofold light, as the gracious gift of Jehovah, the God of the chosen race, or as blessings bestowed in the ordinary providence of God. Leah's first children, granted to her notwithstanding the disfavor of her husband, are viewed under the former aspect, 29:31-35. Those that follow in ch. 30 are regarded under the latter aspect, viz., the children of the handmaids sprung from the jealous strife of Jacob's wives, those of Leah* after she had bargained for her husband's presence, and Rachel's son born after her long envy and impatience. Upon his birth she gives utterance to her hope that Jehovah would add to her yet another. Thus Jehovah begins and ends the series, encircling the whole and enclosing the providential favors granted between these limits.

The critics may object to this as an artificial arrangement; but they have nothing better to propose. The narrative of these successive births is plainly one and indivisible and cannot be rent asunder and converted into such a piece of patchwork as they are obliged to make of it. The style and method are the same, the language and phrases are the same, the narrative is continuous, each part bound to and implying the others. So that even Vater (*Pentateuch*, II., p. 724) with all his predilection for the fragmentary hypothesis, enters his protest against subdivision here and against the assumption on which it rests that the same writer could not use both Elohim and Jehovah; an assumption that is falsified by nearly every book in the Bible.

In 30:2 Elohim is evidently in place from the suggested contrast of God and man. Laban recognizes that it was Jacob's God who had blessed him for Jacob's sake; hence Jehovah vs. 27,30. It was Jehovah, 31:3, who bade Jacob return to the land of his fathers; but in repeating this to his wives, who were but partially reclaimed from idolatry, 30:11; 31:34; 35:2,4, he uses throughout Elohim, 31:4-13 (once, more definitely, the God of my father, v. 5), as they also do in their reply, v. 16. In like manner it is Elohim, who speaks to Laban the Aramean, 31:24,

* Note Leah's lingering heathenism in her allusions to "fortune" (Gad) and "good luck" (Ashera) vs. 11-18.

and of whom Jacob speaks to Laban, v. 42, though both of them recognize his identity with the God of Abraham and of Isaac, vs. 29,42. Hence when they covenant, appeal is made both to Elohim and to Jehovah, vs. 49,50, cf. 53. Jacob's own prayer is addressed to Jehovah, 32:9. Elohim is used, vs. 28,30; 33:10, because of the contrast expressed or implied between man and God, and in 33:11 because Esau is addressed, who is outside of the line of the covenant.

B. The Critical Partition. 1. Ch. 28:10-22.

Guided by Elohim, vs. 12,17 sqq., and Jehovah, vs. 13-16, the critics parcel this passage between E and J. But J, v. 16, speaks of Jacob waking from sleep with no previous mention of his being asleep. He says, "Jehovah is in this place," which is explained, v. 19, to be Bethel. But if v. 19 is given to J, as seems essential and as is commonly done, two difficulties arise.

(1) The whole point of E's account according to the critics is to glorify Bethel as a sanctuary, p. 283; and yet he does not mention it nor intimate in any way in the entire passage where this scene occurred. Wellhausen tries to find it in v. 22, alleging that to be a doublet of v. 19; but it plainly is not there.

(2) J gives no suggestion how Jacob came to be at Bethel.

Verses 10-12 are absolutely necessary to explain the situation in vs. 13-16. They are equally necessary to vs. 17,18. Under the pressure of the latter necessity Kautzsch gives vs. 10-12 to E. But the mention of Beersheba as Jacob's point of departure, v. 10, implies Isaac's residence there, as recorded by J, 26:33, but not by E. And Haran, to which he was going, also points to J, 27:43; 29:4; it does not occur in E. But with v. 10 given to J, E lacks any proper beginning. Hupfeld (*Quellen*, p. 156) made the attempt to split v. 11 by assigning "he lighted upon a certain place and took one of the stones of the place and put it under his head" to E, and "he tarried there (where?) all night because the sun was set and lay down in that place to sleep" to J; but he gave it up as impracticable. Any division of the passage creates a gap in both documents, neither of which can be filled but by trenching upon the other. The whole passage is, moreover, closely linked with ch. 27, where we have found a critical division equally impracticable.

But in evidence of the composite character of the passage we are pointed to an alleged doublet, vs. 16-17. The latter verse is characterized, p. 283, as "a clumsy addition, which one writer would not make." With the best endeavor to do so I have not been able to comprehend the point of view, from which it can be considered "clumsy" and indicative of more than one writer, or anything but the most natural and appropriate exclamation under the circumstances. V. 17 does not duplicate v. 16, but is its suitable sequel.

The vision of the ladder and the angels, v. 12, cannot be separated from the revelation of Jehovah which follows, p. 283, and which, v. 15, interprets it.

According to its most probable interpretation, **עַלְיוֹן** upon it, v. 13, is an explicit reference to the ladder, though it may also be rendered "by him." A ladder reaching to the skies on which angels were ascending and descending might entitle the place to be called "the gate of heaven" but not "the house of God," v. 17; nor could it be said that God there appeared unto Jacob, 35:1,7 E. The preamble of Jacob's vow, vs. 20,21a, repeats in almost identical terms the promise which Jehovah had just made, v. 15. And 21b, of which the critics try to rid themselves because of its "Jehovah," is most appropriate where it stands, whether it continues the preamble, as is most probable, or introduces Jacob's own pledge. Jehovah had announced himself as the God of Abraham and of Isaac, v. 13, would he likewise be, as was implied in his promise, Jacob's God? But if this clause be, as the critics will have it, an insertion from J or an addition by Rj, it remains to be explained how either J or Rj should have fallen upon a characteristic phrase of P 17:7; Ex. 6:7; 29:45.

Wellhausen finds indications of a diversity of writers in the order in which the points of the compass are named, 28:14, W., E., N., S., but 13:14, N., S., E., W.; in "all the families of the earth" **הָאָדָם**, 12:3; 28:14, compared with "all the nations of the earth" **הָרָגֵז**, 18:18; "in thee and in thy seed," 28:14, compared with "in thee," 12:3. But Dillmann and others have no difficulty in attributing all alike to J. The fact is that where distinct writers are assumed on independent grounds, there is no difficulty in gathering up arguments from varied words and phrases to sustain a predetermined conclusion; but these will be set aside without ceremony by the critics themselves when they have no end to answer by them.

2. Chapters 29; 30.

The critics here find themselves in a serious muddle. According to Hupfeld (*Quellen*, p. 65) ch. 29 bears so evidently the stamp of J, that the opposite view, which is perfectly arbitrary, needs no refutation. Wellhausen is just as confident that 29:1-30 is with trifling exceptions from E, while Dillmann compromises the matter by making nearly an equal division, and giving 29:2-15a to J and the rest almost entirely to E. Hupfeld (*Quellen*, p. 43) maintains that 30:1-24 continues J's history without the traces of a seam, with the same basis and presuppositions, the same manner and language; while in the judgment of Wellhausen and Dillmann it is "a very remarkable piece of mosaic from J and E." The trouble in 29:1-30 is that there are no divine names; the trouble is increased in 29:31-30:24 by the fact that there are divine names.

The arguments urged to establish the duplicate character of the latter paragraph are chiefly

1. The repeated occurrence of Elohim.
2. The different explanations given of the names Issachar, Zebulun and Joseph.

To the first of these Hupfeld replies

a. Elohim in 30:2,8 is no criterion because the predominant, if not exclusive, biblical usage requires it rather than Jehovah in such expressions as are there employed.

b. In the etymologies of the names, e. g., in vs. 6,8,18,20,23 as in proverbs, the general term Elohim as the more poetic would naturally be preferred.

Where there are two explanations of the same name he concedes that something has been inserted from another source. But there seems to be little cogency in this consideration. Issachar (*sachar* hire) is associated with Leah's hiring by mandrakes and hiring by the gift of her maid; Zebulun with *zabad* endow and *zabal* dwell; Joseph with *asaph* take away and *yasaph* add. These are not to be regarded as discrepant explanations of these names, implying different views of their origin or of the occasion of their being given, but simply different allusions to the meaning or the sound of the names, which by no means exclude each other. Such allusions are multiplied in the case of Isaac. The name means *laughter*; and we are told how Abraham laughed and Sarah laughed incredulously when his birth was predicted, and how God made her to laugh for joy and all her friends to laugh with her when he was actually born. There is no inconsistency in these statements and no need of parcelling them among different writers. It is the same writer playfully dwelling upon different aspects of a theme which interests him.

Dillmann⁴ thus apportions the record of the birth of Jacob's children: J, 29:31-35; E, 30:1-3a (including *bear upon my knees* as 50:23 E); J, 3b (*that I may be builded by her*, as 16:2 J); J or rather P, 4a; J 4b,5; E, 6; J, 7; E, 8; J, 9a; P, 9b; J, 10-16; E, 17-20a; J, 20b; J or R, 21; P, 22a; E, 22b; J, 22c; E, 23; J, 24. And this in a paragraph, which bears the most abundant and positive evidences of unity from first to last in continuity of theme, consistent method of treatment, cross references, style and language.

"Leah was hated," 29:31, see vs. 18,20,30. "Opened her womb," 29:31; 30:22 opposed to **נִצְעַת shut**, 20:18; 16:2, cf. 30:2. "Rachel was barren," 29:31; see 30:1sq.,22sq. "Conceived and bare a son," "called his name," "and said," 29:32, the same formulas with very slight variations recurring throughout. The language of the mothers refers in every case to the jealousy between the wives on account of Jacob's preference for Rachel and Leah's

fertility. **מֵבָד הַנְּזֶה** 29:34; 30:20. "My husband will—because I have borne him—sons," 29:34; 30:20. **עֲמֹדָה מִלְרָת** 29:35; 30:9. **עוֹד** 29:33,34, 35; 30:7,19. Bilhah, 30:4; Zilpah, v. 9, cf. 29:24,29. Fifth, 30:17; sixth, 18, son of Leah referring to the preceding four, 29:32-35. "God hearkened unto," 30:17,22; with the whole paragraph, cf. 32:22; 35:23-26. In formality of set phrases and in repetitions it is equal to any paragraph attributed to P.

The critics may well infer that this portion of the story must have been very strikingly alike in J and in E, if R could thus pass back and forth from one to the other with no perceptible effect upon his narrative. The fact is that the paragraph is without seam woven from the top throughout and the critics have mis-

taken the figures deftly wrought into the material for patches slightly stitched together; and they try to rend it accordingly but it will not tear. There is really nothing for them to do, but to cast lots for it, which of the documents shall have it. If the paragraph had been purposely constructed with this view, it could not more effectively demonstrate the futility of using the divine names and alleged doublets for parcelling the text of Genesis.

The critical disposition of 30:25-43 is based on the unfounded assumption of discrepancies between it and 31:7sqq., 41 both in respect to the chronology and the contract between Laban and Jacob.

According to 31:41 Jacob served Laban twenty years, fourteen for his two daughters and six for his cattle. But, 30:25sqq., the bargain about the cattle was made after the birth of Joseph, and, 29:20-28, Jacob was married to Leah and Rachel, after he had already served seven years. Now it is alleged that he could not have had eleven children in the next seven years. The fallacy lies in failing to observe that there were four mothers. The narrative is linked throughout by Wāw Consecutive: but this does not prove that each several clause follows its predecessor in regular chronological succession.* The children are grouped by their mothers, and thus the order of thought deviates from the order of time. Rachel's jealousy was roused and Bilhah introduced to Jacob, 30:1sqq., before Leah ceased bearing, 29:35. Leah's four sons were born in rapid succession, and as soon as she found that she was not at once to have another, 30:9, she substituted Zilpah, and before Zilpah had her second son, she had herself conceived her fifth, v. 17. Thus her sixth son could be born within the seven years, and Joseph's birth have taken place about the same time. Dinah, v. 21, was born afterwards and is not to be included within the period in question. The alleged discrepancy accordingly is not proved.

How is it with the bargaining between Laban and Jacob? p. 284. The latter charges that Laban had sought to defraud him by changing his wages ten times, 31:7, 41, but that by God's interference this had been turned to Jacob's profit. On the other hand, in 30:31sqq., Laban assented to an arrangement which Jacob himself proposed and which Jacob, by a trick, turned to his own advantage. The two statements are not in conflict, but supplemental to each other. Chapter 30 describes the original arrangement and Jacob's device. Chapter 31 tells how Laban modified it from time to time with a view to his own interest, but his selfish plans were divinely thwarted.

The comparison of ch. 30 and 31 accordingly supplies no basis for the assumption of discrepant account from different writers. But Wellhausen fancies a discrepancy in ch. 30 itself, alleging that vs. 32-34 are inconsistent with

* See pp. 147, 148. Hengstenberg, *Authentie des Pentateuchs*, II., p. 351, appeals to Ex. 2:1, where though Moses was born after Pharaoh's cruel edict, 1:22, the marriage of his parents must have preceded it.

their context. He understands these verses to mean that the spotted and brown cattle at that time in the flocks were to constitute Jacob's hire; whereas vs. 35, 36, they were separated from the flocks and given not to Jacob but to Laban's sons. The difficulty is altogether imaginary and is simply due to a misinterpretation of the brief and elliptical statement in v. 32. The real meaning is, as Dillmann correctly states, that the speckled and brown cattle to be born thereafter were to be Jacob's; and as a preliminary measure those of this description, that were then in the flocks, were set apart as Laban's.

The doublets alleged are quite trivial and appear at once upon examination to be unreal, v. 26a does not repeat 25b, but supplements it. Verse 26b is repeated in 29, but it is for the sake of adding 30, that Jacob might impress upon Laban the obligation under which he had already laid him. Verse 31a repeats the offer 28, which Jacob had declined to answer in the first instance, preferring to give Laban an idea of what he was entitled to, before he made any demand. Dillmann himself sets aside Wellhausen's suggestion that 39a is a doublet of 38b. The central clause of v. 40 is magisterially declared be a later insertion, but as no reason is given, and none is apparent, no answer is necessary. These can scarcely be regarded as establishing the existence of a composite text, derived from distinct sources.

And the argument from language is, if possible, weaker still. Dillmann has but three expressions to adduce in proof that 30:25-43 belong to J. One of these פָרִזׁ occurs likewise in E, Ex. 1:12; בְּגַלְלָה is found in the Hex. (Deut. excepted) but twice beside, so that מֵצָא חֹן is the only one that has even any seeming force. And against this stands the damaging admission that "J has here adopted many individual expressions from E."

3. Ch. 31:1-43.

Chapter 31:1-43 is by the critics mainly assigned to E, on account of the repeated occurrence of Elohim, its alleged contrariety to ch. 30 and the revelations in dreams to Jacob, v. 11sqq., and Laban, v. 24, all which have been sufficiently explained already; also the reference in v. 13 to 28:20sqq. which we have no disposition to dispute. This passage is assigned by the critics to E, but it has already been shown to be intimately connected with vs. 13-16, J, from which the attempt is vainly made to sunder it.

Dillmann further urges the following expressions: תְּרִפִּים vs. 19,34,35 occurs nowhere else in Hex., being limited to this passage which is in question. לְבַנְ הָרָמִי vs. 20, 24 nowhere in E but in this passage; besides only 25:20, P, cf. 28:25 P, and once in Deut. אֲכֹהֶה v. 33 is made a criterion of E and every passage containing it is for that reason, if possible, ascribed to E;

but besides being found several times in Deut., it occurs Ex. 20:10 in connection with P phrases and an allusion to P, Gen. 2:2,3, also in Lev. 25: 6,44bis P (Dill.); שְׁפָחָה occurs instead in E, Gen. 20:14; 30:18, and it is only by the questionable device of cutting a clause out of an E context and assigning it to P or J that the admission is escaped that E uses it also in 29:24,

THE PENTATEUCHAL QUESTION.

189

29; 30:4,7. **לְבָבֶךָ** occurs five times in J according to Dillmann, Lev. 19:17; 26:36,41; Num. 15:39; Josh. 7:5 to six times in E. **כִּי** in a local sense *here* v. 37, for which 22:5; Num. 23:16 E, Ex. 2:12, E (Dill.), J (Well.), are cited as additional examples; but there is no such deviation from the ordinary meaning of the particle as to suggest the peculiarity of some particular writer. **פָּהַר יְצָהָר** v. 42, cf. 53

nowhere else; and even **פָּהַר** besides in Hex. only in Deut. and Ex. 15:16 a passage supposed to have been borrowed by E from an older document but not written by him. **כִּי** vs. 7,41 nowhere else. How an argument can be drawn from these expressions in favor of E rather than J as the author of this paragraph, is hard to see.

It is claimed that, while this paragraph is for the most part from E, vs. 1,3, 21b,25,27 are insertions from J. But v. 2 is not an idle repetition of v. 1; it is additional to it. Labán as well as his sons had become disaffected towards Jacob. And both together prepare the way for v. 3, which stands in no special relation to v. 1, as the scheme of the critics implies. Nor does v. 3 interrupt the connection. It supplies the occasion of v. 4; and v. 5 explicitly refers to and repeats the language of both v. 2 and v. 3. It is true that v. 3 has "Jehovah," which is unwelcome to the critics here, but it cannot be helped. It is precisely equivalent to "the God of my father," v. 5. The verse is appropriate and required where it stands, and Jacob adopts its very words, v. 13, in reciting at length to his wives what is briefly and summarily stated in this verse. The expression **כָּל אֲשֶׁר לֹ** descriptive of property is not peculiar to J, as Hupfeld would make it (Quellen, p. 161, note). It is found also in E, 31:21; 32:24; 45:10,11, and, but for the critical splitting of the sentence, in 46:1.

The middle clause of v. 21 is no superfluous repetition. The account of Jacob's leaving, vs. 17,18, is interrupted by a necessary digression, vs. 19,20, explaining that it was without Laban's knowledge. Verse 21a resumes the notice of his departure; 21b repeats the opening words of v. 17 to add that he crossed the Euphrates; 21c states the direction of his flight. All proceeds regularly and naturally.

That Laban's pursuit was successful is summarily stated, 23b. Then further details are given: Laban's dream before he came up with Jacob, v. 24; Laban's overtaking Jacob, and the respective location of the two parties, v. 25. There is no doublet here any more than there is in the various instances of like nature which have been reviewed before. Nor is v. 27 a doublet of v. 26. If the repetition of a thought so prominent in Laban's mind offends the critics, how is it that they can refer v. 27 with its triple repetition to a single writer?

According to Wellhausen, vs. 10,12 are an interpolation of uncertain origin. Dillmann, who deals largely in transpositions to accomplish critical ends or to relieve fancied difficulties, thinks that R took them from a narrative of E, which he had omitted in its proper place, and inserted them here rather inappropriately in this address of Jacob to his wives. What motive he could have had for such a piece of stupidity we are not informed. The genuineness of the verses is saved, but it is at the expense of R's good sense.

When a writer has occasion to speak of the same matter in different connections, three different courses are open to him. He may narrate it both times in all its details, he may narrate it fully in the first instance and refer to it more briefly afterwards, or he may content himself with a brief statement at first reserving the details until he recurs to it again. In the directions to build the tabernacle minute specifications are given, Ex. 25:10-ch. 30; in its actual construction all the details are stated afresh, 36:8-ch. 39, the sacredness of the edifice making it essential to note the exactness with which the divine directions were carried into effect in every particular. But while the detailed directions are given for building the ark, Gen. 6:14sqq., in recording its construction, the general statement is deemed sufficient that Noah did as he was commanded, v. 22. Pharaoh's dreams, because of their importance in the history, are twice narrated in full and in almost identical language, Gen. 41:1-7,17-24. So the dream of Laban, 31:24,29, the story of Abraham's servant, 24:3sqq.,37sqq., the flats of creation, Gen. 1, etc. But the dreams of Joseph, 37:5sqq., and of Pharaoh's servants, 40:5,9sqq., are simply mentioned as facts and the details given, when they came to be narrated by the dreamers.

In the instance at present before us instead of twice recording the divine communication made to Jacob in all its details, the writer simply states at first that Jehovah directed Jacob to return to the land of his fathers, 31:3, leaving a more minute account of the whole matter to be introduced subsequently in a recital by Jacob. It is entirely appropriate in the connection that the revelation here made to Jacob should concern both his relation to Laban and his return to Canaan. The only difficulty is created by the needless assumption that things are here combined which belong to different periods of time; that what is said respecting the cattle must belong to the early period of Laban's dealings with Jacob,* while it is here united in the same dream with the command to return to Canaan. The dream is retrospective and was intended to teach Jacob that while he had been relying upon his own arts to increase his compensation the true cause of his prosperity was in the favor of God. Wellhausen alleges that the words of the divine angel must have begun with the words, "I am the God," etc., v. 13; but this is disposed of by a reference to Ex. 3:4-6. Dillmann remarks that E uses בָּרֶךְ, 31:10,12, where J has טַלּוֹא, 30:32,33; but that absolute precision in the use of these terms is not aimed at is apparent from the fact that J, 30:35, uses עֲקֵדָה and נִקְדָּה interchangeably, but, v. 39, distinguishes between them.

Verse 18 (except the first clause) is assigned to P. It has the usual phrases of patriarchal removals, cf. 12:5; 13:6; 36:6,7; 46:6. The resemblance between

* הַיּוֹם צָאתְנִי denotes a season of the year, the time of copulation of flocks, and should be rendered "the time that flocks conceive" as a usual thing, rather than "conceived," as though the reference were to a definite event in the past. It is as applicable, therefore, to the last year of Jacob's abode with Laban as to any that had preceded.

these verses is certainly such as to suggest their common origin; and the critics refer them uniformly to P, but upon what ground it is difficult to see. It is at variance with the connection in every individual case; 12:5; 13:6 are torn from a J context; 31:18; 46:6 from an E context,* and the context of 36:6,7 is disputed. The minute specification of particulars, alleged to be characteristic of P, is no greater than in 32:6,23 J; 34:28,29 R taken perhaps from E; 45:10 E or J. Of the words and phrases said to be indicative of P, not one is peculiar to him. "To go to his father" links it with 35:27 P indeed, but equally with 28:21 E. No good reason can be given why these verses should not be reckoned an integral part of the context in which they are found. This is particularly so in this instance, in which the presence of E words† at the beginning makes it necessary to partition the sentence, leaving only an incomplete fragment for P, in which nevertheless one of these very words (**מִקְנָה**) recurs, as it does also in a like connection, 36:6.

רַכֵּשׁ (verb) occurs only in the series of passages now in question. **רַכְוֹשׁ** (noun) occurs besides in Gen. 14 (four times), 15:14 R in a J chapter, Num. 16:32 R in a JE passage, 35:3 P. Its belonging to P once out of seven times is a slender argument for making it characteristic of P and dragging these other passages after

it. **קָנֵין** besides 31:18; 36:6 which are now in question occurs in the Hex. only, 34:23; Josh. 14:4 P, and Lev. 22:11, which according to Well. is not P. **פָּרָן אֶרְםָ** assigned to P 33:18 in a JE connection; in 46:15 the critics are not agreed whether it belongs to P. **אֶרְץ בְּנֵעַן** in J and E as well as P; see Sec. 5, Language of P.

But accepting the partition on the sole dictum of the critics, the result is an enormous gap in P. He makes no mention of Jacob's arrival in Paddan-aram, or of his residence there, or anything that occurred during his stay in that region, not even of his marriage, the one sole purpose for which he went, as the critics understand P, or of the birth of his children or of his accumulation of property. There are only the disconnected and consequently unmeaning statements, 29:24,29, that Laban gave maids to his two daughters, and, 30:22, that God remembered Rachel; but what either the daughters or their maids had to do with the life of Jacob does not appear. And now Jacob is returning with cattle and property, to which there has been no previous allusion and no suggestion of how they were obtained but no hint that he had a family.‡ J and E supply what is lacking, though a marriage was no part of the purpose with which according to them Jacob left his home. And further P at a later time, 35:22-26, recites the names of Jacob's children in the

* The supplementary hypothesis, which identified E and P, had a basis here for the reference of these verses to the "Grundschrift," which the present critical hypothesis has not.

† **מִקְנָה** claimed for J or JE, p. 246; **גָּרָן** which recurs in E, v. 26, with explicit reference to this passage, and is found besides in Hex. (except twice in Deut.), Ex. 8:1; 14:25 E; Ex. 10:13 J. If to avoid mutilating the sentence the whole verse is given to P, the argument from the JE use of these words elsewhere is confessed to be worthless.

‡ The supplementary hypothesis, which made E and P one document, here again escaped this incongruity.

order of their birth and refers them to their different mothers in exact accordance with the detailed account in JE which is thus presupposed. What the critics sunder from P is thus an essential part of his narrative. And it is necessary for them to resort again to the assumption that P did write just such an account as we find in J and E, but R has not preserved it. Nevertheless R, who has here dropped P's entire story at a most important epoch, that which laid the foundation for the tribal division of Israel, and thus reduced his narrative to incoherent fragments, elsewhere introduces clauses and sentences which in the judgment of the critics are quite superfluous repetitions of what had been more fully stated before, for the mere sake of preserving everything contained in his sources.*

But the strangest feature of P's whole account is thus clearly and succinctly stated, p. 276:

"The absence of the theological element is quite conspicuous: (1) The daily life of the patriarchs (with the exception of a few special and formal theophanies) is barren of all religious worship. (2) This is especially noticeable in the case of Jacob; he leaves home to seek for the wife who is to be the mother of Israel; he sojourns many years in the land from which Abram was by special command sent away; he marries according to the instruction of his parents, and begets the children who are to become the tribes of Israel;—still no sacrifice or offering is made to God for his providential care, not even a prayer is addressed to the Deity. (3) Nor does God, on his part, descend to take part or interest in human affairs; He gives no encouragement to Jacob as he leaves home, nor does he send any word to him to return."

This comes near enough to the "unthinkable" to be a refutation of that critical analysis, which is responsible for such a result. P is the priestly narrator, to whom the ordinances of worship are supremely sacred and they absorb his whole interest; whose history of the patriarchs is only preliminary and subsidiary to the law regulating the services of the sanctuary. The patriarchs are to him the heroes, and the models of Israel, whom, we are told, he is so intent on glorifying that he reports none of their weaknesses, no strifes, no act of disingenuousness, no strange gods in their households, nothing low or degrading. He singles out for prominent mention the sabbath, 2:2,3; the prohibition of eating blood, 9:4; the ordinance of circumcision, 17:10 sqq. God appears to Abraham and establishes his covenant with him and with his seed, with the express condition of his walking before him and being perfect, i. e., wholehearted in his service, 17:1 sqq. And yet P's account of the patriarchs, as the critics furnish it to us, is almost absolutely denuded of any religious character. Is P really so absurd and self-contradictory, or have the critics made a mistake?

* E. g., 7:17,22,23; 8:2b,3a; 13:6; 19:29.

4. Ch. 31:44–32:3.

The account of the covenant between Laban and Jacob is in the opinion of the critics a mass of doublets and glosses. There are two monuments, a pillar, 45, and a heap of stones, 46; two covenant meals, 46b, 54; two names with their respective etymologies, 48, 49; two (or rather three) appeals to God to watch, witness, and judge between them, 49, 50, 53; and the substance of the contract is stated twice and in different terms, 50, 52. The symmetry of this statement is somewhat spoiled by the triplicity of one of the items. But the passage would seem to afford ample scope for critical acumen. The result is that J, 46, 48–50, tells of the heap of stones in pledge that Jacob would treat his wives as he should, with some dislocations to be sure, which Dillmann corrects as usual by the necessary transpositions; the covenant meal, 46b, and the naming of the heap, 48b, ought to come after the engagement, 50. Of course R is charged with having removed these clauses from their proper place and no very good reason is given for his having done so. E, 45, 47, 51–54, records the erection of a pillar as a boundary between the Hebrews on the one side and the Arameans on the other.

But Delitzsch mars this arrangement by calling attention to Jehovah in v. 49, and Elohim in v. 50, showing that both J and E related Jacob's pledge in relation to his wives; also to the triple combination of the heap and the pillar in vs. 51, 52, showing that J and E also united in fixing the boundary between Laban and Jacob. So that it appears after all that there were not two covenants, but two stipulations in the same covenant. Dillmann is further constrained to confess that E speaks of a **לֹא** “heap” as well as a “pillar” in v. 52, inasmuch as 47b is a doublet with 48b, and E as well as J located this scene in Mt. Gilead and was concerned to find an allusion to its name in the transaction. He clogs his admission with the assertion that E uses **לֹא** in a different sense from J, but after all the critical erasures made for the purpose this is still unproved. He has merely demonstrated his desire to create a variance which does not exist. And v. 47, which he assigns to E, is indissolubly linked with 48 J.

We thus have good critical authority for saying that one and the same writer has spoken of both the monuments and of both the contracts, involving of course the double appeal to God to watch over their fulfillment. And from this there is no escape but by the critical knife, of which Wellhausen makes free use here, as he never fails to do in an extremity. Verse 47* is thrown out of the text as a piece of “superfluous learning.” “Jehovah watch between me and thee when we are absent one from another,” 49, and “no man is with us; see Elohim is witness betwixt me and thee,” 50, must go also. “Mizpah,” v. 49, which is a clear voucher for the genuineness of the doomed clause that follows, and a name which the

* Tuch on the contrary finds in the Aramean name in this verse an apt parallel to the Aramean פָּרַע (for which Hosea, 12:13, substitutes the Hebrew equivalent, שָׂרֵה אֶרְם), and he refers both to the same author.

historian was at pains to link with this transaction as well as Gilead and Mahanaim, 32:3, is by a stroke of the pen converted into *Mazzebah* "pillar" and then ejected from the text. "This heap" with its adjuncts is twice expunged, vs. 51, 52a, and "this pillar," 52b. With the text thus cleared of obstructions he has a comparatively clear course.

It is obvious to observe further that the two covenant meals are a fiction. Upon the erection of the heap preliminary mention is made, v. 46, of the festival held beside it, which is then recorded more fully, after other details have been given, in v. 54. We have already met repeated examples of the same kind. Delitzsch refers to such parallels as 27:23; 28:5.

With the doublets thus disposed of the analysis, which has no further basis, collapses entirely. The carping objection that acts in which both participated are, vs. 45,46, attributed to Jacob, and, v. 51, claimed by Laban, gives no aid nor comfort to the critics, for the discrepancy, such as it is, is between contiguous verses of the same document. The utmost that could result, if the discrepancy were a real one, would be to justify Wellhausen in eliminating "Jacob" from the text of vs. 45,46. The suspicion cast upon "the God of their father," v. 53, because the verb is interposed between it and "the God of Nahor," with which it is in apposition, is also a pure question of textual criticism without further consequences. But it might be supposed that such strenuous antitraditionalists as the critics would look with a kindly eye upon this phrase, by which Laban would class Abraham with the innovators.

It may further be noted that different terms to express the same thought do not always imply distinct writers; to "set up" (a pillar) is in E, v. 45, but 28:18,22, שִׁים, and 35:20; and "collecting stones" is expressed differently in successive clauses of v. 46. Moreover the use of לְקַח by E, vs. 45,46, remarkably resembles what Dillmann claims to be characteristic of P, Gen. 12:5 and elsewhere.

5. Ch. 32:4-33:17.

Hupfeld is commonly acute enough in detecting grounds of division, but here for once he is completely at fault. This entire paragraph seemed to him (*Quellen*, p. 45) to bear the most conclusive marks of unity in language, in the continuity of the narrative and in the close connection of the several parts, which mutually presuppose and are indispensable to each other. The interchange of divine names Jehovah (32:10) and Elohim gives him no trouble, since the latter occurs only where according to general Hebrew usage "Jehovah would not be appropriate," 32:29,31; 33:10, or "Elohim is preferable," 33:5,11.

Wellhausen admits that this whole passage is closely connected throughout and that it gives the impression of having been drawn from but a single source. "One will surely wonder," he adds, "at the idle acuteness which nevertheless

succeeds here in sundering J and E." He has discovered a doublet, which had previously escaped all eyes and by its aid he rends the passage in twain. Verse 14a is repeated 22b.* He infers that vs. 14b-22a only carry the narrative to the point already reached by vs. 4-13. These two paragraphs are not consecutive as they appear to be, and as the nature of their contents would seem to imply, but are parallel accounts of the same transaction, drawn respectively from J and E. Other critics have followed in the wake of Wellhausen, as though he had made a veritable discovery. And a fresh evidence of duplication has been sought in the double allusion to the name Mahanaim, which E and J understand and explain differently. Only Wellhausen and Dillmann unfortunately cannot agree how E did understand it. They are clear, however, that J regarded it as a dual and meant to explain it by the "two companies" or camps into which Jacob divided his train, vs. 8,9,11; whereupon he must have added, "Therefore the place was called Mahanaim." Rj prudently omitted this statement because of its conflict with v. 3. But such a mention of the name of the place by J is implied in 14a, "he lodged *there*." Undoubtedly "there" refers to a place before spoken of, either one actually found in the text, 32:3 E (the wrong document for the critics) or one that they tell us ought to be there though it is not.

About E's view of the matter there is not the same agreement. Wellhausen alleges that he took Mahanaim for a singular, and was correct in so doing, *aim* being a modified form of the local ending *ām*, and v. 22 he writes it as a singular *Mahane*; the name was suggested by his meeting a host of angels. Dillmann makes it a dual also to E, suggested by the two companies or camps, that of the angels and that of Jacob.

Will it be disrespectful to the critics to say that they seem here to have stumbled upon a genuine mare's nest? Different allusions to the name Mahanaim in the same connection are not an indication of distinct writers, as we have already seen repeatedly in other instances. And the preliminary statement, v. 14a, that Jacob passed the night at Mahanaim, followed by further details of what was done before the night actually arrived, vs. 14b-22, is quite in accordance with Hebrew style, as we have found again and again. There is no warrant in all this for the divisive and dislocating proceedings, of which it is made the pretext.

Further, according to the division of the critics, E, v. 18, presupposes the coming of Esau announced in J, v. 7, and all the arrangements made in E imply apprehensions which are only stated, v. 8. They are in fact so interwoven that they cannot be separated. And Dillmann finds it necessary to assume that vs. 4-7 are preliminary alike to E and J, though his only ground for suspecting their composite character is the twofold designation of the region, v. 4, as "the

* The figures are those of the Hebrew Bible and correspond to 13a and 21b of the English version.

land of Seir, the field of Edom." Certainly no one but a critic intent on doublets could have suspected one here. Mount Seir had been spoken of, 14:6, as the country of the Horites. Esau had now taken up his quarters, provisionally at least, in what was to be his future abode and that of his descendants. This is here intimated by calling Seir by anticipation "the field of Edom."

But Dillmann has another doublet, which even Wellhausen had failed to see, and this exhausts the entire stock of arguments for the division of these chapters. Verse 23 is J's and v. 24 E's account of crossing the Jabbok. In the former Jacob crosses with his family; in the latter he sends his family before him and himself remains behind. And this is paraded as a variance, requiring two distinct writers. Is it not as plain as day that v. 23 is a general statement of the fact that they all alike crossed the stream? while, v. 24, it is stated more particularly that he sent his family and his goods over in the first instance and that a very remarkable incident occurred to himself, after he was thus left alone.

Here again the critics diverge, leaving us to form our own opinion as to the worth of the criteria on which their conclusions are based. Is vs. 24-33 by J, the author of 32:4-14a and 33:1-17? or by E, the author of 32:14b-22? Wellhausen says J most decisively; Dillmann says E with equal positiveness. Other critics follow their liking one way or the other. The decision, as Delitzsch truly says, is "purely subjective."

But all critical differences are sunk, we are informed, p. 284, in one grand consensus. "They are unanimous as to the existence of an analysis," whether they can agree upon any particular analysis or not. And we have had abundant exemplification of the fact, that where there is a determination to effect the partition of a passage notwithstanding the clearest evidences of its unity, it can always be done with reason or without it.

Dillmann's argument from the language for the partition of this passage is scarcely worth repeating. As far as it has any force, it simply indicates the common authorship of both chapters. The change of divine names is explained by Hupfeld. שְׁפָחָה 32:6; 33:1,2,6 is found in E as well as J. The precise phrase רֵין לִקְרָאת run to meet occurs besides 33:4,

but three times in Hex., 18:2; 24:17; 29:13, all J; but לִקְרָאת occurs repeatedly both in E and J, see Sec. 5, Language of J. חַצָּה but twice in Genesis, 32:8; 33:1; besides in Hex., Ex. 21:35 *bis* E; Num. 31:27,42, P (later constituents). מֵצָא חַן בַּעֲנִי Gen. 32:6; 33:8,10,15, see p. 175 (6:5-8).

1) LANGUAGE OF P.

(1) אֶרֶץ בְּנֵעַן (4) פָּרָן אֶרְם (3) רַכְשׁ (2) רַכְשׁ

see above under 31:1-43 (on v. 18).

2) LANGUAGE OF J.

OLD WORDS.

(1) already explained. (2) נָצַב עַל also in E, Ex. 5:20; 17:9; 18:14; Num. 23:6,17. (3) נָבֹךְ בָּ but three times in O. T., 12:8; 28:14, J;

18:18, R. (4) לִקְרָאת (5) אַנְכִּי, p. 174 (6:17). (6) וְתַהֲרֵךְ, p. 155, (35). (7) עַתָּה, p. 155. (8) הַפְּעָם, p. 155. (9) עַל-כֵּן (10) נָא.* (11) מֵצָא חַן (12) בְּגָלֵל.*

* Sec. 5, Language of J.

(14) שָׁוֹם, p. 154, שִׁית also in E, Gen. 41:33; 46:4; Ex. 7:23; 21:22,30; 23:1,31. (15) מְולֶדֶת, p. 177. (16) לְלוֹן. (17) עֲבָדָה. (18) נְשָׂא עַנֵּים. (19) לְלָמָה וְהַלְלָמָה, p. 164 and under ch. 21. (20) אַחֲרָה, p. 163. (21) אַחֲרָה, * p. 163. (22) אַחֲרָה (verb).‡

NEW WORDS.

(1) פָּרֶץ Gen. 28:14; 30:30,43; 38:29; Ex. 19:22,24, J; Ex. 1:12, E, all in Hex. (2) אַבְּנָה Gen. 28:16, J; Ex. 2:14, E, all in Pent. (3) עָרָר Gen. 29:2,3,8; 30:40, J; 32:17,20, E, all in Hex. (4) נְלָל Gen.

29:3,8,10; 48:18, J; Josh. 5:9; 10:18, E. (5) נְאָזֶן Gen. 29:4; 42:7; Num. 11:13, J; Josh. 2:4; 9:8, JE. (6) בְּשָׁר relative Gen. 2:23,24; 29:14; 37:27, J, all in Hex. (7) שָׁאָר בְּשָׁר said to be its equivalent in P, Lev. 18:6; 25:49, has not exactly the same sense, being used exclusively of prohibited degrees of marriage. (7) חַשְׁטָה (verb) Gen. 30:27; 44:5,15; Lev. 19:26, J, all in Hex, except once in Deut., נְחַשָׁה (noun), Num. 23:23, E; 24:1, J. (8) נְחַל Gen. 33:14; 47:17, J; Ex. 15:13, E, all in Hex.

RARE AND POETIC WORDS.

These, of course, have no significance whatever.

(1) מְחַשְׁךָ 30:37,38, J, nowhere else. (2) פְּצִילָה 30:37, J, nowhere else. (3) קָשָׁר be early 30:41,42, J. (4) עַטְפָּה be late 30:42, J. (5) רְפָקָה 13, J. (6) חַבְקָקָק 29:13; 33:4, J; 48:10, E. (7) נְקַבָּה 30:8, E. (8) דְּרוֹאָהִים 30:14,15,16, J. (9) נְקַבָּה 30:14, פְּתַלְלָה

30:28, E; Num. 1:17, P. (10) רְהַתִּים (Gen. 30:38,49; Ex. 2:16, J. (11) תְּקֻעָה 31:25, J. (12) צְפָה 31:49, J. (13) לְאַטָּה 33:14, J. (14) יְעַשָּׂה 29:26, E; 34:7, J; Lev. 4:2,13,22,27; 5:17, P.

3) LANGUAGE OF E.

OLD WORDS.

(1) אַלְמָן § (2) בְּבָקָר (3) הַשְׁכִּים (4) הַבְּכָה, the baba, explained above. (4) דָּרְן, p. 176. (5) חַפְעָם, חַפְעָם, p. 163. (6) וּתְהַרְתָּה, p. 155 (35). (8) מְקַנֵּה, מְקַנֵּה (9) נְתַחֵן permit.§ (10) עַתָּה, עַתָּה, p. 155. (11) אַנְכִּי, אַנְכִּי (12) עַתָּה, עַתָּה, p. 155. (13) מְלֹדֶת, מְלֹדֶת (14) אַמְּמָה, but in 30:18 where the hypothesis requires אַמְּמָה. (15) מְשִׁים, שִׁים, see p. 164. (16) אַהֲלָה, אַהֲלָה, p. 165. (17) כְּמַשְׁמֵשׁ, כְּמַשְׁמֵשׁ, see p. 164.** (18) הַשְׁמֵר לְךָ, הַשְׁמֵר לְךָ, p. 165. (19) עַבְדָּךְ, עַבְדָּךְ, p. 164. (20) סְמִינָה + pers. pron.† (21) לְלָבָב, p. 164. (24) אַמְּמָה, אַמְּמָה (25) בְּקוּלָה, בְּקוּלָה, see under ch. 21.

(26) בְּנֵל כְּנֵל, the hocich (27) אַעֲלֵל כְּנֵל, see under ch. 20. (28) כְּרִתְבָּרִת בְּרִית, p. 174.

NEW WORDS.

(1) פְּגַע בְּ פְּגַע בְּ Gen. 28:11; 32:2, E; Josh. 2:16; 17:10 JE; Gen. 23:8; Num. 35:19,21; Josh. 16:7; 19:11,22, 26,27,34, P. (2) מְנוּעָה Gen. 30:2; Num. 22:16, E; Num. 24:11, J. (3) תְּמוּלָה שְׁלַשּׁוֹם, תְּמוּלָה שְׁלַשּׁוֹם, Gen. 31:2,5; Ex. 5:7,8,14; 21:29,36, E; Ex. 4:10, J; Josh. 20:5, P. (4) הַתְּלִל Gen. 31:7; Ex. 8:29, E. (5) יְרִיחָה throw Gen. 31:51, J; Ex. 15:4; 19:13; Num. 21:30; Josh. 18:6, E. (6) נְנַזֵּן Gen. 33:5,11; 42:21, E; 43:29; Ex. 33:19, J; Num. 6:25, P.

RARE AND POETIC WORDS.

These, of course, have no significance whatever.

(1) מָרָאשָׁתוֹן, Gen. 28:11,18, E, all in Hex. (2) סְלָמָם, 28:12, E, nowhere else. (3) מְשַׁכְּרָה, 29:15; 31:7,41, E, all in Hex. (4) רְפָה deceptive, 29:25; Josh. 9:22, E, all in Hex. (5) בְּכָר, בְּכָר, Gen. 30:20, nowhere else. (6) זְלָבָב, 30:20, J, nowhere else. (7) מְזִינִים, 31:7,41, E, nowhere else. (8) תְּרֵבֶּם, 31:19,34,35, E, nowhere else in Hex. (9) הַדְּרַבְּנִיק 31:23, E, all in Hex., but once in Deut. (10) נְטַש permit, 31:28, E, all in this

sense. (11) הַסְכִּיל 31:28, E, all in Hex. (12) אַלְלָה 31:29, E. (13) נְכַסְּפָה 31:30 bis, E, all in Hex. (14) בְּרִרָה, 31:34, E, nowhere else. (15) חַפְשָׁה, 31:35, E; 44:12, J; all in Hex. (16) דְּלָקָה pursue ardently, 31:36, E, all in Hex. (17) רְחַל 31:38; 32:15, E, all in Hex. (18) חַרְבָּה, 31:40, E, all in Hex. (19) קְרַחָה, 31:40, E, all in Hex. (20) אַבְּקָה, Gen. 32:25,26, E, nowhere else.

* Sec. 5, Language of J.

† Sec. 6, Language of J.

‡ Sec. 7, Language of J.

§ Sec. 6, Language of J.

¶ Sec. 5, Language of J.

¶ Sec. 6, Language of E.

** Sec. 7, Language of J.

SEC. 9. 33:18-37:1.

1. The Critical Partition of 33:18-34:31.

This passage is a fresh puzzle for the critics, which they labor to resolve in various ways, and hence there is no little divergence among them. The difficulty here is not the chronic one of disentangling J and E, but of releasing P from the meshes in which it is involved. It is a notable refutation of the statement, p, 284, "whatever difficulty may attend the separation of J and E, the writer, P, as opposed to both of them, is always distinct and decisive." And it is a clear illustration of the fact that, wherever part of a narrative is conceded to P, it is interlocked with the other documents as closely as they are with one another. This passage is so linked with what precedes and follows in the history, there are so many references to other passages in it and from other passages to it, it is so allied by forms of expression and ideas contained in it to passages elsewhere, and all this runs counter in so many ways to the prepossessions and conclusions of the critics, as to form a veritable labyrinth through which it requires all their adroitness to thread their way.

The name of God occurs but once in the entire passage, 33:20, so that all pretext is cut off for division on that ground.

Ch. 33:18-20 completes an important stage of Jacob's journey begun 31:17 and continued ch. 35, while it is immediately preliminary to the incident recorded in ch. 34. The simple statements contained in these verses, naturally as they belong together, give no small trouble to the critics, who are obliged to parcel them among the different documents.

"And Jacob came in peace to the city of Shechem, which is in the *land of Canaan*, when he came from *Paddan-aram*," v. 18a, is given to P because of the italicized characteristic expressions; and yet it explicitly alludes to Jacob's vow, 28:21 E, whose condition is declared to have been fulfilled, and hence, 35:1 E, the performance of what he then stipulated is demanded. There is no escape from this manifest reference in one document to the contents of another, but by striking "in peace" out of the text. Again, P here records the termination of an expedition on which he had laid great stress at Jacob's setting out, 28:1-5, but all between these limits is almost an absolute blank. P has not said one word to indicate whether Jacob had accomplished the purpose for which he went to Paddan-aram. Still further, Jacob's route, it is said, is purposely laid through the holy places Shechem and Bethel, 35:6,15. The fact is just the reverse of what is alleged. The hallowing of certain localities in later times did not give rise to the stories of their having been visited by patriarchs and being the scene of divine manifestations. But their association with the history of the patriarchs imparted a sacredness which led to their selection as places of idolatrous worship. Admitting, however, the explanation of the critics, why should P and J, 12:6,8, who

belonged to Judah, be concerned to put honor on the schismatical sanctuaries of northern Israel?

"Shechem which is in the land of Canaan": the relative clause is not a needless expletive, due to P's customary verbosity, p. 286. It emphasizes the fact that Jacob has now at length reached the holy land from which he had been so long absent. And "Luz, which is in the land of Canaan," 35:6, has the same significance; the implied contrast is not with "another Luz," but with another land in which Jacob had been ever since he was at Luz before.

Verse 19 is repeated Josh. 24:32, which records the burial of the bones of Joseph in the plot of ground here purchased, and by critical rules is assigned to E, who as a North-Israelite would be interested in this event as P and J would not. Jacob's ownership of land near Shechem is confirmed by his flocks subsequently feeding there, 37:12 in J, who thus seems to be aware of a fact only stated in E. This peaceable purchase, however, is alleged by Kuenen and others to be at variance with the violent seizure related 34:25-27, as though this were a conflicting account from another source of the way in which Jacob came into the possession of property in that quarter. And yet v. 19 is plainly preparatory for ch. 34. Hamor is called "Shechem's father" for no other reason than to introduce the reader to the prominent actor in the narrative that follows, 34:2; this can only be evaded by pronouncing "Shechem's father" a spurious addition by R. E too, 48:22, refers to a conquest by force of arms, which must have been additional to the purchase; a conclusion which Wellhausen seeks to escape by giving v. 19 to J (Judean though he is) and ascribing 34:27 not to J but to some unknown source. Jacob's purchase recalls that of Abraham, ch. 23 P, and is based on the same principle of acquiring a permanent and a legal right to a property in the holy land. There is certainly as good reason to claim that they are by the same author as the critics are able to advance in many instances in which they assume identity of authorship as undoubted.

"El-Elohe-Israel," v. 20, clearly refers back to 32:29 the change of the patriarch's name, thus clinching Dillmann's conclusion that the wrestling on the banks of the Jabbok must on critical grounds be assigned to E, whose anthropomorphism here equals that of J. But this name, 33:20, which points to E is linked with the erection of an altar, which is commonly distinctive of J, 12:7,8, etc. E for the most part sets up pillars instead, 28:18; 35:14,20. The text must accordingly be adjusted to the hypothesis. The only question about which there is a difference of opinion is, shall "altar" be erased and "pillar" substituted? Or shall R be supposed to have had two texts before him, "built an altar" J and "set up a pillar" E, which he has mixed by taking the verb from E and the noun from J?

Dillmann suspects that 18b is from J because of "encamped," which occurs but once besides in Genesis, 26:17 J, though in subsequent books repeatedly both in P and E, and **את-פנִי** 19:18,27; Ex. 34:23,24 J, but also Lev. 4:16,17; 10:4 P.

and Gen. 27:30; Ex. 10:11 E. If J relates what occurred at Shechem, ch. 34, it is certainly to be expected that he would mention Jacob's arrival there. So that P, J, E and R are all represented in fragments of these three verses; and one scarcely knows which to admire most, the ingenuity of a Redactor who could construct a continuous narrative in this piecemeal fashion or that of the modern critic who can unravel such a tangled web.

The stress laid upon circumcision in ch. 34 by the sons of Jacob recalls its institution in the family of Abraham, ch. 17, and the transactions in the public meeting of citizens resemble those in ch. 23, and there is a striking similarity of expressions in these chapters, e. g.:

בְּכָל־זֶכֶר vs. 15,22, cf. 17:10,12.
הַמֹּלֵךְ לִכְמָה כָּל־זֶכֶר vs. 24,25, cf. 17:23.
עַرְלָה v. 14, cf. 17:11,14,23 sqq.
הַחֲנוּן עַשְׂנִיא v. 2, cf. 17:20; 23:6.
סָחָר v. 10, cf. אַחֲנָה 17:8; 23:4,9,20.
כָּל־יִצְאָר שָׁעַר עֵיר v. 24 bis, cf. כָּל־זֶכֶר 23:18.

28:10,18. תְּכִמָּה vs. 5,13,27 is a technical term of the ritual law and is found nowhere else in the Pentateuch. Dillmann adds as characteristic of P from the critical stand-point -אל שְׁמָעַ vs. 17,24, קְנִין v. 23, נְקָדָה vs. 15,22,23.

All this points to P as the author of the chapter. But according to the current critical analysis P knows nothing of the various characters here introduced, nor of the chain of events with which this narrative is concatenated; and in fact the narrative itself is altogether out of harmony with the spirit and tone of this document as the critics conceive it. It is E, 30:21, that records the birth of Dinah, evidently with a view to what is here related of her; just as 29:24,29 is preparatory for 30:4,9; 22:23 for 24:15 sqq.; 19:15 for vs. 30 sqq. Otherwise it would not have been mentioned, cf. 32:22; 37:35; 46:7. It is J and E that tell of the sons of Jacob, 34:7,27, cf. 29:32 sqq., and particularly of Simeon and Levi, own brothers of Dinah, 34:25. It is E that tells of the change of Jacob's name to Israel, 34:7, cf. 32:28, and introduces the reader to Shechem and his father Hamor, 34:2, cf. 33:19. It is J and E that detail the various trials with which the life of Jacob was filled in one continuous series from the time of the fraud which he practised upon his aged father and his brother Esau, viz., his compulsory flight, Laban's deceiving him in his marriage, attempting to defraud him in his wages and pursuing him with hostile intent on his way to Canaan, his alarm at the coming of Esau, and last and sorest of all the loss of his favorite Joseph. P makes no allusion to any of these troubles. They are all of one tenor and evidently belong together, and this disgrace of Jacob's daughter fits into its place among them. And we are told that it is alien to P to record anything derogatory to any of the patriarchs. There are subsequent allusions also to this history both in J 49:5,6 and in E 35:5; 48:22.

This chapter is thus strongly bound to P on the one hand and to J and E on the other in a manner that is not compatible with the original separateness of these so-called documents. Tuch, who recognized no distinction between P and E, unhesitatingly assigned ch. 34 to P; so did Ewald, Gramberg and Stähelin.

Knobel on the ground of certain alleged J expressions supposed that the original narrative of P was supplemented and enlarged by J. Hupfeld, unable to dispute the unity of the chapter, gave it in the first instance to E in spite of its admitted relationship to P (*Quellen*, p. 46), as Ilgen had done before him; but on second thought he assigned it to J (*Quellen*, pp. 186 sqq.), in which Kayser and Schrader follow him.*

But it was reserved for Wellhausen to discover that what all preceding critics had accepted as a consistent narrative was capable of being resolved into two quite dissimilar stories. He inserts his wedge between vs. 26 and 27, and at one blow of his mallet the whole chapter falls asunder. In vs. 25,26 and again v. 30 the deed is imputed to Simeon and Levi, but in v. 27 to the sons of Jacob, i. e., the children of Israel. According to one account, J's, it was a family affair. Simeon and Levi avenge the wrong done their sister by entering Hamor's house and killing Shechem when he was off his guard to the great offence of Jacob. There was no circumcision in the case. Shechem had offered any dowry, however large, in order to obtain Dinah in marriage. We have no means of knowing how much was demanded; but, whatever it was, Shechem had promptly paid it. The other account deals with international relations, out of which perhaps the story grew. It cannot therefore belong to either P or E, but is of unknown origin. It is an affair between the Bne Israel and the Bne Hamor, whose capital was Shechem. The latter submitted to circumcision with a view to a friendly alliance, and when disabled in consequence were treacherously massacred.

Yet the evident allusions to this history in E oblige Wellhausen to confess that he must have had a similar narrative in this place as the motive for Jacob's removal from Shechem. It is also unfortunate for his analysis that v. 25 has to be reconstructed; for in its present form it implies the circumcision and affirms the assault upon the city and the massacre of its citizens, showing that Simeon and Levi had assistance. And this is confirmed by v. 30, where Jacob apprehends reprisals not from the Shechemites, but from the inhabitants of the land generally, and also by 49:5,6, which speaks of violence done to oxen as well as men.

Kuenen† agrees with Wellhausen as to the verses assigned to J, except that he considers it an open question whether J may not have "represented the circumcision of Shechem (not of all the citizens) as a condition laid down in good faith by the sons of Jacob." The remainder of the chapter in his view constitutes not a separate version of the story, but an addition by R, "one of the later diaskeu-

* In how serious a quandary Hupfeld finds himself in regard to the disposition of this chapter is apparent from the manner of his argument in reversing his prior decision. He says that the grounds for referring it to P are "weighty and difficult to be set aside;" on his original assumption that 33:19 and 35:5 belong to E, he cannot conclude otherwise in regard to ch. 34; nevertheless 49:5-7 compels him to assign it to J, while 48:22 makes it necessary to maintain that E had here a similar narrative which R has not preserved.

† *Hexateuch*, pp. 147, 326.

asts of the Hexateuch," with the view of giving an altered complexion to the narrative and bringing it into its present form.

Merx* follows Böhmer in eliminating from the narrative all that relates to the dishonor of Dinah, the deceit of her brothers and the plunder of the city as interpolations. What is left is regarded as the original story as told by a writer in North Israel. It is to the effect that Shechem asked the hand of Dinah in honorable marriage, giving the required dowry and submitting likewise to the condition of being circumcised together with his people. But Simeon and Levi treacherously fell upon them in their sickness and murdered them to Jacob's great alarm. The rest of his sons did not participate in the deed. He thus saves the honor of Dinah, but takes away all motive for the conduct of Simeon and Levi.

The design of the original narrator was to affix a stigma upon Simeon and Levi, as these tribes adhered to the southern kingdom and the worship of Jerusalem. The interpolations of the Judaic Redactor were apologetic. They represent Simeon and Levi as avenging the honor of their house, while the other tribes are also involved in the transaction and are solely responsible for the plunder that followed.

Delitzsch† partitions the verses differently and finds two accounts by P and by J essentially agreeing. In both Dinah is seduced by the young prince, who then earnestly desires her in marriage; the circumcision of the Shechemites is made the condition in both; in both Dinah is taken off and brought back again. There is beside a brief passage from E, recording the capture and sack of Shechem simply as an exploit of the sons of Jacob.

Dillmann has still a different analysis, which is thus paraphrased, pp. 285, 289. P: "Dinah is seen by Shechem, the son of Hamor, the prince of the land; and he asks his father to get her for him as a wife. Hamor accordingly makes a proposition of intermarriage and commerce to Jacob's family. It is accepted on condition that the prince and his subjects be circumcised, which is complied with." J: "And he [=Shechem‡] takes her [=Dinah‡] and outrages her, loving her passionately. Jacob hears of the insult, but waits till his sons return from the field. They receive the horrible tidings with mingled sorrow and anger, and when Shechem proposes to do whatever they will ask of him, if only they will let him have their sister, they demand of him deceitfully [that he and all the people be circumcised‡]. He complies with all haste. Then Simeon and Levi fall upon the helpless city, slay all the males in it, and rescue Dinah."

* Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexikon*. Art. Dina.

† He remarks that נָעַל = עֲלָל in each of the twenty-one times in which it occurs belongs to J or D. This is equivalent, we presume, to a retraction of his opinion expressed in Lüthardt's *Zeitschrift* for 1880, Art. No. 8, that this as well as חִזְקָה = אֵחֶזְקָה is traceable to the manipulation of the text by later diaskeuasts, instead of being, as it has commonly been regarded, an archaic form properly belonging to the original text of the passages in which it occurs and characteristic of the Pentateuch.

‡ "This must be supplied from other material."

Now which are we to believe, Wellhausen, Kuenen, Merx, Delitzsch, or Dillmann? They each profess to give us the original form or forms of the story, and no two agree. Is it not apparent that the critical process of each is purely subjective? The critic makes out of the narrative just what he pleases, selecting such portions as suit him and discarding the rest. The result is a mere speculative fancy, without the slightest historical value. And what is so evident here in this discord of the critics, attaches equally to their methods and results where they follow in each other's tracks. The text is decomposed *ad libitum* into fragments of documents and emendations or additions by various editors and redactors. The whole thing is regulated by the will or the preconceived ideas of the critic and is a mere subjective creation with only basis enough in the literary phenomena to give it a faint savor of plausibility.

The abruptness of this narrative in P, who has made no previous mention of any of the parties concerned, has already been referred to. Its incompleteness (as given by Dillmann) is suggested by the unanswered question, p. 285, "What became of Dinah?" It is insupposable that negotiations of such a character should be carried on to the extent indicated and no mention made of the issue. It seems that Dinah could not have married Shechem, since P speaks of her as a member of Jacob's family, when he went down into Egypt, 46:15. If not, why not, since the condition on which it was dependent was fulfilled? Why is nothing further heard of this circumcised community at Shechem, and of the intercourse and intermarriages here anticipated? Is there any explanation of this silence, except that given in the verses which Dillmann has so carefully excised, and of which Kuenen justly says (Hex., p. 326), "I cannot see any possibility of separating these verses, 27-29 and the corresponding expressions in vs. 5,13" from P's account."

It is said, p. 287, that this story in P has "a legal purpose." It is surely very inconsistent in P to enact such a law as is here supposed. He informs us that Esau's marriage with Canaanites was a great grief to his parents, and that they would not consent to such a marriage on the part of Jacob. And yet here he is supposed to favor a general regulation for intermarriage with Canaanites on condition of their being circumcised. J's estimate of the Canaanites and of the peril of contamination from alliances with them agrees with P's, 24:3; 13:18; 15:16; 18:20sq., ch. 19 (cf. v. 29 P). Even on the principles of the critics themselves it cannot be imagined that P here sanctions what is in absolute antagonism to the positive injunctions of every code of laws in the Pentateuch, viz., E, Ex. 23:32,33; J, Ex. 34:12,15,16; Num. 33:52,55,56. Holiness laws, Lev. 18:24,25; 20:22,23; D, Deut. 7:3, as well as the unanimous voice of tradition, Josh. 23:12,13; Judg. 3:6; 1 Kgs. 11:1,4. And if P be thought to be post-exilic, it would be more inconceivable still, Ezra chs. 9, 10; Neh. 10:30. And if he formulated such a law, what is to be thought of the honesty or loyalty of R in perverting it to its opposite as is done in this narrative?

"Dinah, Leah's daughter, which she bare to Jacob" is cited, p. 286, as an example of the superfluous precision of P's style. How is it with J, 22:20,23, though Milcah's relation to Nahor, and Nahor's to Abraham had been stated by him, 11:29? "The father of Shechem in 34:6 is superfluous;" cf. vs. 13,26, J, and the repetition of "Dinah the daughter of Jacob," vs. 3,5, J. "v. 9b adds nothing to 9a," cf. the identical amplification in D, Deut. 7:3. It is confessed that the story of Dinah is "an anomaly" in P, as the critics conceive of that document. Does not its admitted occurrence there raise the question whether their conception is certainly correct? It may not be as barren of narratives as they suppose, nor fail to note disorders in patriarchal households.

The following are given, p. 287, as proofs that ch. 34 is "a combination;" the bare recital is sufficient to show their inconclusiveness and triviality. (1) "Verse 6, Hamor coming to talk to Jacob is hardly in keeping with v. 5, Jacob's knowledge of the outrage." On the contrary, I should think it to be the very thing that he would be forward to do. (2) "Nor does it go with v. 8, where Hamor speaks with *them* (not Jacob)." This simply shows that the critics are in error in excluding v. 7 and joining v. 8 to 6. (3) "Verse 7 does not fit in." It is exactly in its proper place. While Hamor was on his way to see Jacob, the sons of the latter came from the field, so that they were all together at the interview. (4) "Verses 8-10 have one proposition, made by Hamor, with no offer for any insult inflicted, referring to intermarriage and commerce; while (5) vs. 11,12 have quite another proposition; here Shechem speaks; he asks for a favor, willing to give any dowry or gift; he wants Dinah without any reference to future alliances." What reparation could be made but marriage, which is the thing proposed? And it is perfectly true to nature, that Shechem should have but one thought, his love for Dinah, while his father proposes general amicable relations, under which the acceptance of his son's suit would follow by legitimate consequence. (6) "It is impossible that the writer of ch. 17, who made circumcision the holiest institution of pre-mosaic times, should make the patriarch himself use it here for such an immoral purpose; hence v. 13 cannot be from the same pen with vs. 14-17." To record an act is not to justify it. Moreover Jacob is not credited with any share in the response, v. 13. His estimate of his sons' conduct is given, v. 30 and 49:5sqq. (7) "After v. 25b, 26a is meaningless." It renders prominent the point of chief interest, which though involved in the preceding statement, deserved special mention. (8) "Strangely enough, when we put these opposing parts together, we get two different presentations, each throughout consistent with P and J respectively." How far this is true may be judged of from the preceding discussion.

2. Chapter 35.

The divine names afford no ground for the division of this chapter, since El and Elohim alone occur. The reason is evident. The prominence here given to

the names Bethel and Israel leads to the quadruple repetition of El vs. 1,3,7,11, with which Elohim is most naturally associated, see v. 7. Verses 1–15 plainly form one continuous narrative. Jacob goes by divine direction to Bethel and builds an altar there, whereupon God appears to him and blesses him. The critics, however, partition it between E, vs. 1–8 (for the most part) and P, vs. 9–15.

Accordingly E, vs. 1,4,7, speaks of God having appeared to Jacob in Bethel and answered him in his distress, plainly referring to 28:12sqq. But as the critics divide that passage, E tells of the vision of a ladder with angels; it is only J who tells of God appearing to Jacob and speaking with him. In v. 5 the danger of pursuit, from which they were protected by a terror divinely sent upon the cities round about, points to the deed of blood in ch. 34. But as that was only recorded by J, not by E, this verse is cut out of its connection and assigned by Hupfeld to J (in spite of Elohim) and by others to R. Verse 6a is given to P, because E calls the place Bethel, vs. 1,3. That, however, was the sacred name given to it by Jacob; its popular name was Luz. Nevertheless the consequence is that P speaks of Jacob's coming to Bethel, but E does not; and "there," v. 7, has nothing to refer to. Verse 8 is not "out of place," p. 288. It only interrupts the narrative, as the event itself interrupted the sacred transaction in the midst of which it occurred. Moreover the mention of Rebekah's nurse in E is once more a reference to J, 24:59, by whom alone she had been spoken of before, and that merely to prepare the way for what is here recorded. The question how she came to be with Jacob at this time cannot be answered for lack of information. The writer is not giving her biography, and we have no right to expect an account of all her movements. After Rebekah's death it was quite natural that she should go to be with Rebekah's favorite son.

P, v. 9, speaks of God appearing to Jacob *again*, when he came out of Padan-aram, with definite reference to his having appeared to him the first time on his way to Padan-aram, 28:13, as related not by P, but by J. The word "again" is therefore unceremoniously stricken from the text to make it correspond with the hypothesis. Reference is made, v. 12, to God's giving the land to Isaac; no such fact is recorded by P, only by J or R, 26:3,4. God appears to Jacob, v. 9, speaks to him in familiar and condescending terms, vs. 10–12, and goes up from him, v. 13. For some unexplained reason the comment upon it is, p. 289, "God's appearance to Jacob is as usual formal and distant." In what respect is it more so than in J, 12:7; 13:14; 26:2,24; 28:13; 31:3? "The pillar and sacrifice by a patriarch," v. 14, is confessed to be "a theological incongruity for P," as the critics conceive of him. The reimposition of the name "Israel," v. 10, and "Bethel," v. 15, is judged incredible by the critics and claimed as evidence of two discrepant accounts. But it gave no trouble to R, and need not to us. There are other like instances in the sacred narrative. That no explanation of Israel is here given is, as Dillmann confesses, because 32:29 made it unnecessary, and so is an

implied reference to that passage. Only his critical stand-point obliges him to assume that P must have given an explanation, which R has omitted.

P, 48:7, speaks of the death and burial of Rachel at Ephrath; but as 35:16-20 connects this event with the birth of Benjamin, the latter passage is referred to E on account of its alleged conflict with vs. 24,26 P, where Jacob's twelve sons are said to have been born in Paddan-aram, p. 288. And in like manner it is said, 46:15, that Leah bare thirty-three sons and daughters to Jacob in Paddan-aram; and v. 18, Zilpah bare unto Jacob sixteen. In Ex. 1:5 seventy souls are said to have come out of the loins of Jacob, including Jacob himself, cf. Gen. 46:26,27. Of the twelve tribes of Israel, Ahijah gave ten to Jeroboam, and left one for the son of Solomon, 1 Kgs. 11:30-32. 1 Cor. 15:5 speaks of Christ being "seen of the twelve" after his resurrection, although Judas had gone to his own place. R had no difficulty in understanding that Jacob's sons could be spoken of in the general as born in Paddan-aram, though Benjamin's birth in Canaan had just been mentioned. Is R's interpretation less rational than that of the critics?

To add to the patchwork of the chapter, v. 22a has to be given to J because of the reference to it in 49:4, and this carries v. 21 with it.

The inconsistencies alleged, p. 288, in connection with the age of Isaac have no existence. "35:27-29 makes Isaac still alive on Jacob's return from Mesopotamia; while 27:1,2,4,7,10 emphasizes his being on his death-bed when Jacob left home, at least twenty-five years earlier." Nothing is said of his being on his death-bed. Jacob was 130 years old when presented before Pharaoh, 47:9, in the second year of the famine, 45:11. In the year preceding the first of plenty he was, therefore, 120 and Joseph was 30 (41:46). Jacob had been with Laban fourteen years when Joseph was born, 30:25sqq.; 31:41. Jacob was consequently 75 or 76 when he left home for Paddan-aram, and Isaac was then 135 (25:26). He was old and blind and might well say that he "knew not the day of his death." But he lived forty-five years longer and hence survived Jacob's return several years.

"But Isaac's age is troublesome in another direction, viz.: Isaac was sixty when the twins were born (25:26); he was then scarcely over 100 when Esau married (26:34); but this marriage, according to 26:35; 27:46 and 28:1-9, was the occasion in connection with which Jacob left home." The preceding computation shows that Esau had been married thirty-five years when Jacob left home; and there is no statement or implication in the text inconsistent with this. Calculations which ignore this interval are erroneous. Jacob was not "away from home about eighty years."

"How could Joseph be but seventeen years old (37:2a) after Isaac's death, if born while Jacob was still with Laban?" Joseph was thirty years old and in Egypt when Isaac died. But Isaac's death is mentioned where it is, in order to bring his life to a close before entering upon Jacob's family life in Canaan, as that

of Abraham, 25:8, and Terah, 11:32, are recorded before proceeding with the history of their successors.

3. Chapter 36.

No name of God occurs in this chapter, so that no plea for division can arise from this quarter. Nevertheless the critics are not agreed as to its source, whether all is from P, or if not, just what or how much has been taken by R from J or E. This is another instance in which the affirmation, p. 284, does not hold good: "Whatever difficulty may attend the separation of J and E, the writer P, as opposed to both of them, is always distinct and decisive."

Dillmann confesses that the language and style are uniform throughout; and that "the fine adjustment and arrangement" of the material in the chapter "speak for its unity"; wherein he differs from the allegation, p. 288, that "the disorderly arrangement of material is very conspicuous." It seems, therefore, that this is altogether a matter of taste, in which people may not agree. To the objections that the Horites, vs. 20 sqq., and the kings of Edom, vs. 31 sqq., do not fall within the author's plan he very properly attributes no weight whatever. The critics may, however, settle their differences among themselves. The only matters with which we need concern ourselves are alleged discrepancies and anachronisms.

It is claimed that 36:2,3 conflicts with 26:34; 28:8,9 in respect to the wives of Esau, pp. 288, 289. In the opinion of Wellhausen (*Komp. d. Hex.*, p. 49), "this is the most open contradiction in the whole of Genesis"; and he adds "either the entire literary criticism of the biblical historical books is baseless and nugatory, or these passages are from different sources." We thank him for the word. If the divisive criticism stakes its all on finding a discrepancy here, its chances are slim.

Nöldeke finds no difficulty in referring all to P and assuming that he derived his materials from discrepant authorities. And it is not easy to see why the original author, be he P or who he may, may not have done this as well as R. But the discrepancy is after all imaginary. It is quite insupposable that R or P or any other sensible writer should have inserted without comment or explanation the bald contradiction here alleged. That the passages in question are not altogether at variance and unrelated is apparent from the fact that according to both Esau had three wives; two were Canaanites, one being the daughter of Elon the Hittite, and the third was a daughter of Ishmael and sister of Nebaioth. The other Canaanitess is said, 26:34, to have been the daughter of Beeri the Hittite and, 36:2, the daughter of Anah, the daughter of Zibeon the Hivite. Now Anah, vs. 24,25, was the son (and not the daughter) of Zibeon, and it is plain that Esau's wife could not be the daughter of both Anah and Zibeon in the strict sense of an immediate offspring. Daughter in the last clause of v. 2 must necessarily have

the wider meaning of descendant, cf. also v. 39. Why not in the preceding clause likewise? Why may she not have been the daughter of Beeri, the grand-daughter of Anah and the great-grand-daughter of Zibeon, cf. Matt. 1:1 and comp. Ezra 5:1 with Zech. 1:1? the writer preferring to link her name in this genealogy with her distinguished ancestors rather than with her own father, who may have been of less note.*

That she is said, 26:34, to be of Hittite and, 36:2, of Hivite descent is not more strange than that Zibeon is called a Hivite, v. 2, and a Horite, v. 20. The critics commonly insist that the former is a textual error and should be changed to Horite. Then if, v. 2, Esau's wife can be a daughter of Canaan and at the same time descended from a Horite, what is there in her being a Hittite to conflict with her Horite descent? The fact is that the names of the Canaanitish tribes are not always used with rigorous precision. Hittite, Josh. 1:4, like Canaanite and Amorite, Gen. 15:16, may be used in a narrower or a wider sense, either of the particular tribe so designated or of the population of Palestine generally. And the term Horite is not properly indicative of race or descent, but of a particular style of habitation: it is equivalent to cave-dweller. There is no evidence that the Horites might not be allied in whole or in part to the Hivites, and Hittite might be applied in a general sense to a Hivite.†

The only remaining ground of cavil is that Esau's wives bear different names in the two passages. So Tabitha was also called Dorcas, Acts 9:36, and Peter Cephas, and Joses Barnabas and Saul Paul. Nothing in fact is more common than the duplication of names, cf. Gen. 17:5,15; 25:30; 35:18; 41:45; Ex. 2:18 (and 3:1); Num. 13:16; Judg. 7:1; Dan. 1:7, etc., etc., especially at some important crisis or change of life. Chardin‡ says, "Women change their names still more frequently than men. Women, who marry again, or hire themselves anew, commonly change their names on such occasions." In becoming Esau's wives they left their own tribes to become the heads of a new race, is it strange that they should adopt new names?

Another alleged inconsistency is thus stated, p. 289: "According to 36:6-8 the separation of Esau and Jacob takes place as follows: after Isaac's death; for lack of room; Esau leaving Jacob to go to Seir; but according to 27:41-44 it is before Isaac's death; because of Esau's hatred or Jacob's deceit; Jacob departing from Esau to go to Haran. 32:4 says that Esau was already in Seir before Jacob reached home; but 36:8 locates him in Seir only after Isaac's death, i. e., after

* Hengstenberg suggests very plausibly that Beeri (= *fontanus*) may be another name of Anah, given him in consequence of his discovery of the hot springs, v. 24. We may not have the data for determining with certainty which is the true solution. But so long as any reasonable solution can be shown to exist, the difficulty cannot be pronounced insoluble.

† In like manner Amorite is used, 48:22, in a general sense of the Hivites, Gen. 34:2.

‡ Quoted by Hengstenberg, *Authentie des Pentateuches*, 2, p. 277.

Jacob's return home." Esau with a band of men had a provisional residence in Mt. Seir, but it is nowhere said that he had entirely abandoned Canaan and removed his family and effects from it. He was present at his father's funeral, 35:29; and then the final separation of the brothers took place. Though he had fixed his headquarters for a season in Edom, he had no disposition to yield Canaan or to surrender his right to the paternal inheritance to Jacob, who had defrauded him of his father's blessing. And he came out with an armed force to obstruct his return to the land of his fathers. It was only after Jacob's fervent supplication, 32:9 sqq., and his importunate wrestling for a blessing on the bank of the Jabbok, vs. 24 sqq., that Esau's deadly hate, 27:41, was by divine influence changed to fraternal love, 33:4.

An alleged anachronism yet remains to be considered. "What is to be said of the presence of vs. 31-39 themselves? Could Moses possibly have written them? Does not v. 31 clearly show that it was written at least after the time of Saul or David?" p. 288. Verse 31 reads "And these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel."

The first impression upon a cursory reading of this verse might naturally be that it was written after the establishment of the monarchy in Israel. But a careful examination of the context reveals several particulars calculated to modify this impression. Eight kings of Edom are named in the verses that follow, who are nowhere else mentioned in the history; and we have no data for determining just when they reigned. No king is succeeded by his own son. It would seem, therefore, to have been an elective, not an hereditary monarchy. The death of the first seven kings is mentioned, but not that of the eighth, whence it is probable that he was still reigning when this passage was written. This probability is enhanced by the consideration that the writer seems to be better acquainted with the domestic relations of this king than of his predecessors; at least he mentions the name and lineage of his wife, which is not done in the case of any other.

There was a kingdom in Edom in the time of David, 1 Kgs. 11:14-17, and reference is made to Hadad "of the king's seed in Edom." He cannot be identified with Hadad, v. 36, or Hadar, v. 39, of the passage before us, as he seems never to have reached the throne. Moreover the expression used shows that the succession to the throne was then hereditary. The kingdom was on a different basis from that described in the verses now under discussion.

There was also a king in Edom in the time of Moses, Num. 20:14; cf. Judg. 11:17, as well as in the kindred nations of Moab, Num. 22:4; Midian, 31:8, and Amalek, 24:7; cf. 1 Sam. 15:20. We read also at that time of dukes in Edom, Ex. 15:5, showing that the kingdom was superinduced upon and co-existed with the dukedoms that are likewise spoken of in Gen. 36. From the death of Moses to the choice of Saul as king there were 357 years, 1 Kgs. 6:1; 2 Sam. 5:4; Acts

13:21; Num. **14:33**. Now even supposing the king in the Mosaic age to have been the first that ruled in Edom, we must assign to each of his successors a reign of fifty-one years to fill up the interval to the time of Saul, which is quite insupposable; and the more so, as elective monarchs would in all probability be chosen in mature age, and their reigns be on the average briefer in consequence.

Furthermore, the fourth of these kings, it is said, v. 35, “smote Midian in the field of Moab.” Midian was in alliance with Moab in the time of Moses, Num. **22:4,7**; we are not informed that they were so subsequently. Israel occupied the plains of Moab before crossing the Jordan, Num. **31:12**, and were thence-forward adjacent to its territory. This event was in all probability pre-mosaic.

Edom was so powerful and warlike a people in the Mosaic age, that Israel did not venture to force a passage through their territory, Num. **20:20,21**. This seems to imply that the kingdom had not been recently established. The same thing may be inferred from the mention of “the king’s highway,” **20:17**.

These various considerations conspire to make it extremely probable that several of these kings, at least, were pre-mosaic: why not all? Why may not the last of the series be the one with whom Moses had dealings, and this be the explanation of the fact that the series is carried no further? As Isaac died ten years before Jacob went down to Egypt, Gen. **35:28**; **25:26**; **47:9**, Esau’s final settlement in Seir took place 440 years before the exodus of the children of Israel, Ex. **12:41**. This affords ample time for the establishment of the kingdom in Edom, and the reign of eight kings. If only Moses could have used the expressions in Gen. **36:31**; and why not? It had been explicitly promised to Abraham, **17:6**, and to Jacob, **35:11**, that kings should arise from their seed. Balaam foretells the exalted dignity of the kingdom in Israel, Num. **24:7**. Moses anticipates that when the people were settled in Canaan, they would wish to set a king over them like all the nations around them; and though he did not enjoin the establishment of a kingdom, he gave regulations respecting it, Deut. **17:14**sqq. That was the common usage of the nations. It was the prevalent conception of a well-ordered and properly administered government. Now Jacob inherited the blessing, and Esau did not. Yet Esau had been a compact, thoroughly organized kingdom for eight successive reigns, while Israel had just escaped from bondage, had attained to no such organization, had not yet had a single king. Why was not this a perfectly natural observation for Moses to have made?

I) LANGUAGE OF P.

OLD WORDS.

- (1) **כל** זבר.* (2) **פְּרִן** אֶרְם. (3) **אַרְץ** כְּנָעֵן
see Ex. 18:15 J. (4) **אֲלֹהִים**. (5) **קְרִית אַרְבָּע** in
E Josh. 14:15; J 15:13. (6) **גּוֹעַ**. (7) **הַאֲסֻפָּה**
נְפָשׁ (8) **אֱלֹהָה תּוֹלְדוֹת**. (9) **אַלְעָמִים**

- # **שָׂדֵי** (11) **רַכְשׁ** verb and noun.* (10) # **שָׂרֵל*** (12) **פְּרָה וּרְבָּה** Lev. 26:9 J (Dill.); assigned to
P in a J section, Gen. 47:27. (13) # **זְרוּעַ אַחֲרֵין** (14) **עַרְלָה** (15) # **מָול**

* See under **12:4b,5**.

† Sec. 7, Language of P.

‡ Sec. 5, Language of P.

2) LANGUAGE OF J.

OLD WORDS.

- (1) מִבְקָר ב also in P Num. 36:7,9. (2) מִקְנָה.*
 (3) חֶרֶה, p. 163. (4) נַע.* (5) מֵצָא חַן, p. 175.
 (6) אֲהָל.* (7) עַצְבָּן, p. 155. (8) בְּמַרְמָה (9) אֲהָל
 verb.†

NEW WORDS.

- (1) לְפִי חֶרֶב 34:26 J; Ex. 17:13; Num. 21:24

3) LANGUAGE OF E.

OLD WORDS.

- (1) אֲהָל, Sec. 5, Language of J. (2) מִזְבֵּחַ, p. 175. (3) אֱלֹהִים.

NEW WORDS.

- (1) טָמֵן 35:4; Deut. 33:19 E; Josh. 7:21,22 J; Josh. 2:6 JE; Ex. 2:12 J (Well.) E (Dill.). Derivative מִטְמָנוּן 43:23 J, all in Hex. (2) קְשֻׁה

E; Josh. 19:47 JE in a P connection; also several times in Deut. and Josh. (2) מָלֹךְ 34:12 J; Ex. 22:16, all in Hex.

"Απαξ λεγόμενον.

- (1) דָּבָר עַל לְבָב 34:8, all in Hex.

RARE WORDS.

- (1) חָלֵק הַשְׁרָה 33:19; Josh. 24:32, all in Hex.
 (2) כְּבָרֶת אֶרֶץ 35:16 JE; 48:7 R, all in Hex.
 (3) קְשִׁיטה 33:19; Josh. 24:32, all in Hex.

* Sec. 5, Language of J.

† Sec. 7, Language of J.

THE PARTICLE **את** IN HEBREW. II.

BY ALFRED M. WILSON, PH. D.,

New Haven, Conn.

III. USAGE.

I have treated the subject of usage under two heads: 1) With what class of words, and 2) with what constructions, **את** is used.

1. WITH WHAT CLASS OF WORDS **את** IS USED.

את is used:

1) With Substantives. (1) With the substantive definite in itself, Gen. 21:1, אֶת־דָּשָׁרָה ; Isa. 1:4; אֶת־עֹזָה ; Jer. 47:1; Hos. 1:3 ; Zach. 2:6; אֶת־גָּמָר . (2) With the substantive not definite in itself. (a) With the Article: Deut. 9:5, אֶת־הָדָרָכָר ; 1 Kgs. 20:27, אֶת־ ; Joel 2:25, אֶת־הָאָרֶץ . (b) Without the Article: 1 Kgs. 2:27, אֶת־הַמְּתִים ; Eccl. 4:2, אֶת־הַשְׁנִים . (c) Without the Article: Job 42:10, אֶת־שְׁבָות אַיּוֹב ; Gen. 50:14, אֶת־אֲבֵיכֶם ; Gen. 2:3, אֶת־בָּצֵיר ; Ex. 21:28, אֶת־אִישׁ או אֶת־אִשָּׁה ; Lev. 26:5, אֶת־יּוֹם הַשְׁבִּיעִי ; Isa. 10:2, Prov. 13:21, אֶת־צִדְקִים . But the use of **את** is not restricted to substantives. On the contrary, it is used:

2) With Pronominal Suffixes: There are two cases according as the suffix is light or heavy. With the former, **אות** is used; with the latter, **את**, the form which the particle assumes with *Mäqqéph*.

3) With Demonstrative Pronouns: (1) With זה standing alone. Gen. 29:33; 44:29; Lev. 11:4; Deut. 14:7; 1 Sam. 21:16; I Kgs. 22:27; Eccl. 7:14. (b) With זה, preceded by the Pronominal Adjective כל, Eccl. 8:9; 9:1. (2) With זאת. Gen. 29:27; 2 Sam. 18:17; Jer. 9:11; Ps. 92:7. (3) With אלה. (a) With אלה standing alone. Gen. 46:18; Lev. 11:13; 21:14; Num. 15:13; Isa. 49:21; Ezek. 4:6. (b) With אלה preceded by the Pronominal Adjective כל. Lev. 20:23; 2 Kgs. 10:9; Isa. 66:2; Jer. 3:7; 14:22; Ezek. 16:30; 18:11; Zach. 8:12,17. (c) With אלה preceded by a noun in the construct state, 2 Kgs. 6:20.

4) With the Interrogative Pronoun מי. (1) With מי standing alone. Josh. 24:15; 1 Sam. 12:3; 2 Kgs. 19:22; Isa. 6:8; 28:9; 37:23; 57:11. (2) With מי preceded by a noun in the construct state. 1 Sam. 12:3, "The ox of whom (= whose ox) did I (ever) take?"

Rem. A. But while **את** is used with מי, it never occurs with מה. There is only one apparent exception, viz., Jer. 23:33, where the Pronoun refer-

ring to things follows the particle, **את-מה-משא**. But **את** is to be taken not with the **מה**, but with the whole clause, the object of a verb to be supplied.

5) With the Relative Particle **אשר**. (1) With **אשר** introducing a Relative Sentence. Gen. 9:24; 44:1; Ex. 16:5; 34:11; Lev. 5:8; 13:54; Num. 16:5; 33:4; Deut. 7:18; 18:20; 1 Sam. 10:8; 28:2; 2 Sam. 19:20; 1 Kgs. 2:5; 18:13; 2 Kgs. 5:20; 18:14; Isa. 5:5; 55:11; Jer. 7:12; 38:9; Ezek. 2:8; 5:9; Mic. 6:1; Prov. 3:12; Ruth 2:17; Eccl. 2:12 (obscure verse); 5:3; Esth. 2:1; Dan. 10:14; 1 Chron. 4:10; 2 Chron. 6:15. (2) With **אשר** used to subordinate as object an entire clause. Gen. 30:29; יְרֻעַת אֶת-אֲשֶׁר עָבַדְתִּי; Deut. 9:7; 29:15; Josh. 2:10; 5:1; 1 Sam. 12:24; 2 Sam. 11:21; 2 Kgs. 8:5; 20:3; 1 Kgs. 5:22; Isa. 38:3; Esth. 5:11.

Rem. A. For **את** with **שׁ**, see Cant. 3:1,2,3,4.

6) With the Pronominal Adjective **כל**. (1) With **כל** standing alone. Gen. 9:3. (2) With **כל** with the Article. 2 Chron. 12:9; Eccl. 3:11. (3) With **כל** with pronominal suffix attached. Isa. 57:13. (4) With **כל** followed by an indefinite substantive. Eccl. 4:4. (5) With **כל** followed by a Demonstrative Pronoun. Eccl. 9:1; Isa. 66:2; Zach. 8:12. (6) With **כל** followed by a relative clause. Gen. 1:31; 41:56; Ex. 6:29; 1 Sam. 3:12; 2 Sam. 11:22; 1 Kgs. 11:38; 2 Kgs. 8:6; Isa. 39:2; Jer. 1:17; Ezek. 14:23; Ps. 146:6; Job 42:10; Ruth 3:16; Esth. 4:7; 1 Chron. 10:11; 2 Chron. 33:8.

7) With Numerals. The following list is thought to be exhaustive. (1) With **אחר**. 1 Sam. 9:3; Num. 16:15. (2) With **שלשה**. Josh. 15:14. (3) With **שבע**. Gen. 21:30; 41:4,7,48; Judg. 16:13,19; Esth. 2:9. (4) With **עשרה**. 2 Sam. 15:16; 20:3. (5) With **עشرים**. 1 Kgs. 11:31. (6) With **מאה**. 1 Kgs. 6:61. (7) With **שלוש מאות**. Judg. 7:16. (8) With **אלף-יוםאה**. Judg. 17:3.

8) With **אחר**. Jer. 16:13, "And ye shall serve other gods," **את אללים אחריהם**.

9) With Participles. Ezek. 2:2; **ואשמע את מדבר**; 1 Sam. 14:12; **את-נשא את**; Jer. 49:2; Ezek. 39:10; Mic. 4:14.

To recapitulate, **את** is used with 1) Substantives, 2) Pronominal Suffixes, 3) Demonstrative Pronouns, 4) the Interrogative Pronoun **מי**, 5) the Relative Particle **אשר**, 5) the Pronominal Adjective **כל**, 7) Numerals, 8) **אחר**, and 9) Participles.

2. WITH WHAT CONSTRUCTIONS **את** IS USED.

את is used: 1) With the Accusative of the Direct Object. This, in fact, is its chief use.

But there are, at the outset, three facts to be noted: (1) That **את** is used only when the object is definite as well as direct. (2) That certain words, though

direct and definite, are used almost invariably without **הָנָתָן**; and (3) that when two or more words, the first a Participle followed by an Accusative direct and definite, convey a simple descriptive idea, the **הָנָתָן** is omitted after the Participle, provided that the latter is used without the Article.

1st. **הָנָתָן** with the Accusative Direct and Definite.

To the statement that **הָנָתָן** is used only when the object is definite as well as direct, there are not a few exceptions. For example, Gen. 2:3, **אַתִ־יּוֹם** **רְבָה** **הַשְׁבִּיעִי** and Amos 7:4, **אַתִ־תְּהֻמָּה** **רְבָה**. There are over eighty cases that come under this head. But the number, after all, is not large. Not more than one in every hundred presents any irregularity real or apparent. Nearly half of the books conform entirely to the rule.

The following principles are sufficient to explain most, if not all, of the exceptions.

1) Numerals and Demonstrative Pronouns are in their very nature definite. They may, therefore, be used without the Article. (1) Numerals: Gen. 41:4, **אַתֶ עֲשֵׂר נְשִׁים** **הַפְּרוּתָה**; Num. 16:15, 2 Sam. 15:16; **אַתֶ שְׁבַע** **הַפְּרוּתָה**; 1 Kgs. 6:16, 11:31; **אַתֶ־אֶחָד עֲשֵׂר** **רְבָה**. (2) Demonstrative Pronouns: (a) **זֶה**, Gen. 44:29; Lev. 11:9; Deut. 14:9; 1 Sam. 21:16; Eccl. 7:14. (b) **זֹאת**, Gen. 29:33; 2 Sam. 13:17; Ps. 92:7; Jer. 9:11. (c) **אֱלֹהִים**; Gen. 46:18, Lev. 11:13; Num. 15:13; Isa. 49:21; Ezek. 4:6. 2) **כָל**, though an adjective, partakes of the pronominal character. It is therefore definite even without the article. Gen. 1:21; 29:33; Lev. 11:15; Deut. 14:14; 2 Sam. 6:1; Jer. 25:23; Eccl. 4:4; 12:14; Esth. 2:3; 8:11. 3) A Participle, in the sense of "him who," is, because of the pronominal idea involved, definite. 1 Sam. 14:12; Ezek. 2:1. 4) Nouns followed by an explanatory numeral are definite. Gen. 2:3; 1 Sam. 26:20, **אַתִ־יּוֹם** **הַשְׁבִּיעִי**; 1 Sam. 26:20, **אַתֶ יּוֹם** **פְּרֻעָשׂ** **אֶחָד**. 5) Nouns which in prose require the article, may, in poetry, be used without the article, and yet retain their definite character. 2 Sam. 22:28; Isa. 11:14; 33:19; 41:7; 64:4; Ezek. 26:19; Ps. 34:1; 146:9; Prov. 3:12; 23:6; Job 13:25. 6) Nouns well-known or definite by usage may, even in prose, dispense with the article. Ex. 40:2; Josh. 15:19; Judg. 1:15; Lev. 26:5; 1 Kgs. 12:3. 7) A singular noun representing a whole species may be used without the article. Its definiteness lies in its comprehensiveness. Ex. 21:28; **אַתֶ־אִישׁ** **אוֹ** **אַתֶ־אִשָּׁה**; Num. 21:9; **אַתֶ־אִישׁ**; Judges 7:22; 2 Kgs. 23:20; Isa. 10:3; Eccl. 3:15. 8) A noun modified by a relative sentence is, as a rule, definite. The omission of the article from the noun so modified, though rare, does occur, Josh. 24:14, **אַתֶ־אֱלֹהִים** **אִשְׁר**; 1 Sam. 24:6, **מִצְבַת** **אִשְׁר**; 2 Sam. 18:18, **אַתֶ־כְּנָף** **אִשְׁר**.

Remarks. The following deserve special notice: 1) Judg. 7:8, **וַיָּקֹחַ** **צָדָה** **הָעָם** **בִּידָם**. Either the article before **צָדָה** has dropped out, or as Keil and Delitzsch have suggested, the passage is to be read with the Septuagint, **אַתֶ־צָדָה** **הָעָם**. 2) Jer. 16:13, **וַיַּעֲבֹרְתָם** **אַתֶ־אֱלֹהִים** **אֶחָרִים**. Not clear

why **אֶחָד** is to be regarded as definite. 3) Ezek. 13:20, **אַחֲרֵנֶפְשִׁים**. The omission of the article after **אֲתָּה** is to be explained on the ground that **נְפָשִׁים** had, just before, been more precisely defined. 4) 2 Sam. 23:21 **וְהָוָא הַכְּהָא**, **אַתְּ-אִישׁ מִצְרַיִם**, “an Egyptian.” Gentilics are definite. They may, therefore, be used without the article.

2d. The omission of **אֲתָּה** before certain expressions.

הַרְעָע “the evil,” **הַטּוֹב** “the good,” and **הַיְשָׁרָם** “the right,” are the words which, even when standing as the direct object of the verb, are used almost invariably without **אֲתָּה**. All the cases in which these words occur have been collected and, in the following tables, classified. When contrary to the general usage **אֲתָּה** is used, attention is called to the fact by putting the numbers referring to the chapter and verse in heavy type.

TABLE I. THE OMISSION OF **אֲתָּה** BEFORE **הַטּוֹב**.

Gen.	16: 6	1 Sam.	3:18	2 Sam.	19:19	2 Kgs.	20: 3	Jer.	5:25
Deut.	6:18		14:40		19:28	1 Chron.	19:18		
	12:28		25:30		24:22		21:23		
Judges	19:24	2 Sam.	10:12	2 Kgs.	10: 3	2 Chron.	14: 1		
1 Sam.	1:23		14:17		10: 5		31:21		

TABLE II. THE OMISSION OF **אֲתָּה** BEFORE **הַיְשָׁרָם**.

Ex,	15:26	Judges	21:25	2 Kgs.	10:30	2 Kgs.	22: 2	2 Chron.	27: 2
Deut.	6:18	1 Kgs.	11:33		12: 3	Jer.	34:15		28: 1
	12:25		11:38		14: 3	2 Chron.	14: 1		29: 2
	12:28		14: 8		15: 3		20:32		31:21
	13:19		15:11		15:34		24: 2		34: 2
	21: 9		22:43		16: 2		25: 2		
Judges	17: 6	2 Kgs.	10: 3		18: 3		26: 4		

TABLE III. THE OMISSION OF **אֲתָּה** BEFORE **הַרְעָע**.

Num.	32:18	Judges	3:12	1 Kgs.	16:25	2 Kgs.	17:17	Ps.	51: 6
Deut.	4:25		3:12		16:30		21: 2		54: 7
	9:18		4: 1		21:20		21: 6	2 Chron.	12:14
	13: 6		6: 1		21:25		21: 9		21: 6
	17: 2		10: 6		22:53		21:15		22: 4
	17: 7		13: 1	2 Kgs.	3: 2		21:16		29: 6
	17:12	1 Sam.	15:19		8:18		21:20		33: 2

Deut.	19:19	1 Sam.	20:13	2 Kgs.	8:27	2 Kgs.	23:32	2 Chron.	33: 6
	21:21	2 Sam.	12:19		13: 2		23:37		33:22
	22:21		14:17		13:11		24: 9		36: 5
	22:22		15:14		14:24		24:19		36: 9
	22:24	1 Kgs.	11: 6		15: 9	Isa.	65:11		36:12
	24: 7		14:22		15:18		66: 4		
	31:29		15:26		15:24	Jer.	7:30		
Judges	2:11		15:34		15:28		32:30		
	3: 7		16:19		17: 2		52: 2		

These tables make plain that while **את** is used with **הָרָע** as often as one in nine, **הַיְשֵׁר** **הַטּוֹב** almost entirely dispense with the sign of the Accusative. It may not be easy to explain these facts; but it is to be noted that whenever these words occur, the article is, in each case, either subjective or generic.

3d. The omission of **את** after the Participle.

The following examples will make plain the statement that "when two or more words, the first a Participle followed by an Accusative direct and definite, convey a single descriptive idea, the **את** is omitted after the Participle, provided that the latter is used without the article." 1) Gen. 9:6, "the one who sheds the blood of man," i. e., the man-slayer. 2) Lev. 24:16, **נקֵבֶת יְהוָה**, "the one who curses the name of Jehovah," i. e., the blasphemer. 3) 2 Sam. 15:12, **יוֹעֵץ דָּוד**, "the one counselling David," i. e., David's counsellor. 4) 1 Kgs. 18:17, **עָכָר יִשְׂרָאֵל**, "the one accustomed to get Israel into trouble," i. e., Israel's troubler. 5) 2 Kgs. 7:10, "the one keeping the gate," i. e., the gate-keeper." 6) Isa. 42:5, "the one who created the heavens," i. e., "the creator of the heavens." 7) Isa. 49:7, **נָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל**, "the one redeeming Israel," i. e., Israel's Go'el. 8) Jer. 32:30, **עֲשֵׁים יִשְׂרָאֵל**, "those doing evil," i. e., evil-doers. 9) Mic. 4:14, "the one accustomed to judge Israel," i. e., Israel's judge. 10) Ps. 121:4, **שׁוֹמֵד יִשְׂרָאֵל**, "the one keeping Israel," i. e., Israel's keeper. For additional examples, see :

Gen. 4:9.....	שִׁמְרָא אֲחֵי	45:18	יעַצְרָה אָרֶץ
Num. 35:19.....	נָאֵל הָרָם	51:9.....	מְהֻלָּלָת תְּנִינִי
Deut. 7:9.....	שִׁמְרָה בְּרִית וְחַח'	56:8.....	מִקְבֵּן נְדָחִי 'ש'
1 Sam. 17:22.....	שׁוֹמֵר הַכְּלִים	66:3.....	שׁוֹחֵט הַשׂוֹר
17:41.....	נְשָׂא חַנְחָה	Jer. 10:16.....	יֹצֵר הַכְּלִים
25:16.....	רְעִים חַצְאָן	35:4.....	שִׁמְרָה הַסְּפָר
2 Kgs. 9:31.....	הָרָג אֲדָנִיו	48:10.....	עֲשָׂה מֶלֶאכֶת יְהוָה
Isa. 33:15.....	נָעַר כְּפִיו	Ezek. 16:45.....	גָּעַלְתִ אִישָׁה
40:28.....	בּוֹרָא קָצֹות הָרָץ	Amos 2:15...	תִּפְשַׁח הַקְשָׁת
41:4.....	קָרָא הַדְּרוֹת	9:12.....	עֲשָׂה זֹאת

9:13.....	משך הורע	שמר הפרדים
Mal. 3:18.....	עבד אלהים	שומר הברית
Prov. 11:29.....	עכבר ביהו	נשא כליו
Dan. 9:4.....	שמר הברית	שמר הברית
Esth. 2:14.....	שמר הפלנשימים	שומר הבוגדים
		Neh. 2:8.....
		9:32.....
		1 Chron. 10:4.....
		2 Chron. 6:14.....
		34:22.....

There are, however, a few examples* of the use of **את**, notwithstanding the fact that the Participle with the word (or words) following convey a single descriptive idea. But if the article is prefixed to the Participle, the rule is to use **את** after the same.†

Remark A. In regard to the omission of **את** when the Participle with the word (or words) following conveys a single descriptive idea, it may be said that the participle is, in each case, in the construct relation with what follows—a statement not easy to refute and one which, if true, would account for the absence of the particle. Such a construction does occur; cf. Isa. 42:5, רָקֵעַ הָרִץ ; 51:15, רָגֵעַ הַיּוֹם and Jer. 31:35, רָגֵעַ הַיּוֹם . What is more, because of the loss of the case-endings, it is, in many cases, impossible to decide whether the noun after the Participle is in the Accusative or the Genitive. But for two reasons, I reject the view that, in examples like those cited above, the nouns following the Particles are necessarily in the Genitive: 1) because of cases like the following, Jer. 48:10, עֲשֵׂה מְלָאכָת יְהוָה and Amos 9:12, עֲשֵׂה אֶת, in which the S'ghôl (the sign of the absolute state in the Qal active particle of the Lāmēdh Hē verb) is retained; and 2) because of those cases in which the Participle, though without the article, is followed by **את**, cf. Isa. 33:18, סְפִיר אֶת-הַמְנֻדְלִים and Cant. 1:6 נֶטֶרֶת אֶת-הַכְּרָמִים .

We are now prepared to consider more carefully the use of **את** with the Accusative of the object direct and definite.

We find that **את** is used: (1) When the object is definite in itself. Here belong, in the first place, all those classes noted above, viz., Numerals, Demonstrative Pronouns, Participles and the like. Again there are to be classed here all names of gods, of persons, of cities, of countries and districts, of rivers and mountains, of nations, tribes and peoples. But so far as the names of these objects are concerned, there is no uniformity of usage among the various writers. An illustration of this is to be found in the use of **את**

a. With the Names of Gods.

One writer will, with every such name, use the particle, while another will omit the same. The first Isaiah always used **את** (1:4; 7:12; 8:13; 9:12; 19:21; 29:23; 30:11,12); while the usage of the second Isaiah fluctuates, the **תְּ** some-

* Ex. 8:1; רְעוּ אֶת צָאן יְהוָה ; 2 Kgs. 15:5; Isa. 33:18; Cant. 1:6; 2 Chron. 26:21.

† Isa. 62:6, אֶת יְהוָה ; המוכרים את יְהוָה ; 65:11; Jer. 11:21; 23:2; 34:18; 36:24; 52:25; Mic. 3:5; Ps. 144:10; Dan. 1:13,15; Neh. 8:9; 1 Chron. 15:27; 2 Chron. 17:19; 23:12; 25:3; Lev. 7:14; 1 Sam. 14:39; 1 Kgs. 10:8.

times being used, at other times omitted.* In addition to the first Isaiah, the following writers uniformly use the particle: Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Amos, Jonah, Zephaniah, Ezra, Nehemiah, and the authors of the Hexateuch. The writers of the later Psalms, especially those belonging to the exile and the period of the return, uniformly omit **תְּנָא**. The writers of the Proverbs use **תְּנָא** twice (3:7; 3:9) and omit it twice (14:2(?); 19:17). Job, while using **תְּנָא** four times (1:7,9; 2:2,4), in seven instances (1:1,5,9; 2,3,9; 11,7,7), omits the same. Ecclesiastes uses **תְּנָא** twice (5:6; 12:13) and omits it once (7:18). The writer of the 1st Chronicles employs **תְּנָא** three times (13:12; 29:10,20). He omits it twice (16:11; 21:30). The writer of the 2d Chronicles, in twenty-five cases in which he might have made use of the particle, omits it in only three places (19:3; 26:5; 30:19). There are, in Joshua, Judges, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, 1 Kings, 2 Kings, twenty-eight places where **תְּנָא** might have been used with the name of a god. It is wanting only in Josh. 22:33; Judg. 13:22; 1 Sam. 9:9; 2 Sam. 22:7; 1 Kgs. 21:10 and 2 Kgs. 17:31. In regard to the use of **אֶת** with **אֱלֹהִים** and **יְהוָה**, the following facts are worthy of notice: 1) That they may each one be used without **תְּנָא** (for **אֱלֹהִים**, cf. 1 Sam. 9:9; 1 Kgs. 21:10; Mal. 3:18; Job 1:9; Ps. 55:20; for **יְהוָה**, Isa. 51:13; Prov. 14:2; Ps. 105:4); 2) that while both may be used without **אֶת**, **אֶת** omits the same only in poetry† (2 Sam. 22:7; Mic. 6:6; Ps. 146:2); 3) that in poetry **יְהוָה** omits the particle more frequently than does **אֱלֹהִים**.

b. With the Name of a Person.

As to the use of **תְּנָא** with the names of persons, there is, among the different writers, greater uniformity. In the following books, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 2 Samuel, 1st Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, Jonah, Malachi, Job, Ruth, Esther, Daniel, and Nehemiah, **תְּנָא** is always used. It is omitted once only in Genesis (14:2), 2 Kings (9:2), Ezekiel (26:7), and twice only in 1 Samuel (3:6,8), 1 Kings (22:9,18), Zachariah (7:2,2), and Ezra (8:18,19). In the Psalms, **תְּנָא** is used once (105:42) and omitted four times (89:21; 105:26,26; 106:17). There are, in all the books, only thirty-one exceptions. Sixteen of these, however, are to be found in the **רְבָרִי הַיּוֹםִים**.‡

c. With the Name of a City.

In the use of **תְּנָא** with the name of a city, there is substantially the same uniformity as in the use of the particle with the name of a person. **תְּנָא** is always used in Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1 Samuel, 1 Kings, 2 Kings, 1st Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zephaniah. It is omitted once only in Hosea (10:14), Amos (5:5), Zachariah (2:2), Daniel (9:25), Nehemiah (3:8), 1 Chronicles (5:41), and 2 Chronicles (34:3); three times only in Micah (1:6; 3:10,10), and four times only in the Psalms (51:20; 59:36; 102:13,17). In all, there are only fourteen exceptions.

* Cf. 40:18; 51:13 with 62:16; 62:9.

† Only one exception, i. e., 1 Chron. 16:11.

‡ 1 Chron. 1:32 (five examples); 15:5,6,7,8,9,10; 16:11; 21:30; and 2 Chron. 19:3; 26:5; 30:19.

d. With the Name of a Country.

תְ is used with the name of a country or district in Deuteronomy (34:2,3), 1 Kings (11:15), 2 Kings (14:10 ; 15:29), Jeremiah (25:21), Ezekiel (21:25), Obadiah (19), Zephaniah (2:13), Ps. 60:2 (in inscription), 1 Chronicles (18:2,12), and 2 Chronicles (21:11,13 ; 25:5,19 ; 28:19 ; 34:3,5). The particle is omitted only in Ezek. 23:27 and Zach. 9:13.

e. With the Name of a River.

There are only a few places in which the name of a river is the object of a verb; but only in two such is the **תְ** omitted, i. e., 2 Sam. 19:18 and 1 Chron. 19:17.

f. With the Name of a Nation, or People.

Before the name of a nation, tribe or people, **תְ** is always employed in Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, Ezekiel, Obadiah, Habakkuk, Zachariah, Esther, Nehemiah, and 2 Chronicles. In the 1st Isaiah it is always used (9:11 ; 11:13 ; 14:1). In the 2d Isaiah it is always omitted (42:24 ; 43:3,14,28 ; 44:23 ; 49:5 ; 51:9). The particle is omitted once only in 1 Kings (18:17), 2 Kings (17:2), Jeremiah (40:9), Lamentations (2:5), and 1 Chronicles (10:16); twice in Amos (9:7,7), and five times each in Hosea (5:3 ; 7:11 ; 9:10 ; 10:11 ; 11:19), and the Psalms (25:22 ; 121:4,4 ; 136:11,14).

Again **תְ** is used: (2) When the Object is a pronominal suffix *not attached to the verb*. In every such case, inasmuch as the suffix cannot stand alone, the particle *must* be used. (3) When the direct object is made definite by a pronominal suffix, *provided that the object precedes the verb*. Gen. 3:10, **את-קָלֶך שְׁמַעַת**; Job 2:6, **את-נְפָשָׁו שְׁמַר**; בְּנֵי ; כְּנֵן. Of eighteen such examples in Genesis, only three (12:19 ; 24:14,46) omit the **תְ**. But when the object made definite by a pronominal suffix follows the verb, there are two cases: 1) when the object immediately follows the verb; 2) when the object does not immediately follow the verb. In the latter case, the **תְ** as a rule stands before the object. But when the object made definite by the pronominal suffix *immediately follows the verb*, the **תְ** may, or may not, be used. There are in Genesis one hundred and seventy-three cases which come under this head. The **תְ** is used eighty-eight times; it is omitted eighty-five. (4) **תְ** is used when the object is made definite by the Demonstrative Pronoun. Gen. 31:52, **הַזֹּה**; Deut. 29:13, **את-הָרָכִים הָאֱלֹהִים**; Isa. 29:14, **את-הָבָרִית הַזֹּאת**; 2 Kgs. 18:27, **את-הָעָם-הַזֶּה**. Of one hundred and ninety-nine examples from the Hexateuch, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, and Isaiah, there are only twenty-six in which the **תְ** is wanting. (5) **תְ** is used when the object is made definite by a following definite noun, especially if the latter is definite in itself. (6) **תְ** is rarely omitted when the definite object is modified by a relative clause.

A study of nearly four hundred examples from thirty different books* reveals the following facts: 1) that the **את** is omitted only twenty-five times; 2) that the following books, Joshua, Judges, 1 Samuel, 1 Kings, 1st Isaiah, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Jonah, Zachariah, Malachi, the Psalms, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and 1 Chronicles invariably use the particle when the object is modified by a relative clause; and 3) that Jeremiah omits the **את** only twice in connection with sixty-seven cases so modified.

Note 1. The use of **את** with two (or more) objects. When there are two (or more) coördinate objects direct and definite after the same verb,

לרחץ גלי ורגלי, Gen. 24:32; **את** may be omitted from each object. Gen. 24:32, ותעובי אביך ואמרך; Lam. 3:4; Ruth 2:11, בלה כשרי ועורי; **האנשים**; Additional examples: Gen. 2:9; 50:8; Ex. 16:17; 22:28; Josh. 6:24; Judg. 18:25; Neh. 3:3; 9:32; Esth. 1:11; Lam. 3:19; Cant. 3:10; Ezra 9:12.

Remark A. Compare the omission of **ל** in biblical Aramaic. Dan. 2:5, **הן לא תחרעוני חלמא ופשרה**.

את may be used with each object. The number of examples coming under this head is very large. Josh. 11:12; **את-**כל-עיר המלכים האלה ונתית עלי-ירושלם את קו שמרון; **את-**כל-מלךיהם לכדר והוליד את-עווא ואת-אחדיך; Dan. 1 Chron. 8:7; **את-**משקלת אחאב **את-**צדיק; **את-**מאכלכם **את-**משתיכם; Eccl. 3:17; **asher** מנה **את-**מאכלכם **את-**משתיכם. Additional examples: Gen. 1:21; 13:10; 25:2; 35:4; 50:21; Ex. 14:28; 25:9; 37:24; 39:27-29; Josh. 2:18; 22:5; Judg. 1:27; 13:19; 18:27; Lev. 8:1; 18:5; Num. 4:7; 19:5; Deut. 2:31; 28:36; 1 Sam. 5:11; 2 Sam. 10:7; 1 Kgs. 15:22; 2 Kgs. 24:2; Isa. 9:3; Jer. 19:11; Ezek. 20:40; Hos. 3:5; Amos 4:11; Obad. 19; Jon. 1:9; Mic. 5:5; Zeph. 1:4; Hag. 2:6; Zach. 1:12; Mal. 1:3; Job 42:16; Ruth 4:9; Eccl. 4:4; Esth. 2:1; Ezra 8:36; Neh. 9:36; 1 Chron. 22:13; 2 Chron. 28:21.

את may be used with the first object and omitted from each of the following: Ex. 33:2; Ezra 9:3; **ונרשתי את-הכנעני האמרי והחתי והפרזי**. See also 2 Kgs. 10:11; 1 Chron. 8:1; 2 Chron. 15:19; Neh. 9:6.

Remark A. With this usage, which is not very common, but which is more common in 1 and 2 Chronicles and Nehemiah than elsewhere, compare the use of **ל** in biblical Aramaic. Dan. 3:2, **שלח למכנש לאחשורפניא סגניה ופחותא**.

Remark B. It may be thought that this usage is one of which no examples can be given when the objects are the names of persons; but compare 1 Sam. 19:1, **להמיה את-דוד ויהונתן**; Ex. 12:28; Mic. 6:4; 1 Chron. 1:32; 2:13-15.

* Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Jonah, Zephaniah, Zachariah, Malachi, Psalms, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, 1 and 2 Chronicles.

4. **אֲתָה** may be omitted from the first and yet be used with the following object (or objects). The following list of examples is nearly, if not wholly, exhaustive: Gen. 2:19; 21:10; Josh. 9:9,10; 2 Kgs. 15:37; 17:31; 23:3; 25:19; Ezek. 23:27,35; Esth. 2:20; 9:12; 1 Chron. 2:48,49; 19:7,18, and 2 Chron. 7:7.

But while **אֲתָה** is used chiefly with the Accusative of the direct object, it occurs:

2) With the Nominative Absolute. Gen. 21:13, **וְנִם אַתְ-בִּן-הָאָמָה לְנוֹי**; Isa. 8:13, **וְאַתְ נֶפֶשׁ אֵיבֵךְ יְקֻלָּעָנָה**; 1 Sam. 25:29, **אֲשִׁים-נו**; Lev. 3:3; Josh. 15:63; 1 Kgs. 15:13; 2 Kgs. 9:27; Ezek. 20:16; 2 Chron. 18:13. But the use of **אֲתָה** with the Nominative Absolute is not common.

Remark A. Special Cases. (1) 2 Kgs. 24:16. Several coördinate nominative absolutes. **אֲתָה**, however, is used only with the first. (2) Num. 17:3, **אֲתָה מְחֻთָּה הַחֲתָאִים הָאֶלְּהָ** is either a Nominative Absolute or an Accusative in apposition with **אַתְ-הַמִּיחָתָה** in the preceding verse. (3) Gen. 47:21. According to the Masoretic text, **אֲתָה-הָעָם** is a Nominative Absolute. The verse, therefore, is to be translated thus: "And the people—he caused them to pass over to (or *by*, distributively) the cities from one end of the border of Egypt even unto the (other) end of it." But Professor Delitzsch (*Neuer Commentar über Genesis, in loco*) following the Septuagint (*καὶ τὸν λαὸν κατεδούλωσατο αὐτῷ εἰς παῖδας*), translates, *Und das Volk liess er ihn knechten zu Knechten von einem Ende des Gebiets Aegyptens bis zur andern.*

3) With the Accusative of Subordination. This Accusative is subordinate to and not co-ordinate with, the object with which it is connected by the Wāw Conjunctive.

There are two cases:

1. Those in which the Accusative of Subordination is joined to a preceding Nominative.

1 Sam. 26:16, **וְעַתָּה רָאָה אֵיכָנִית הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲתִ-צְפָּחַת הַמִּים**, "And now behold, where is the king's spear together with the cruse of water?"

Remark A. There is, in Esth. 4:16 ("I, also, along with my maidens, will fast so"), an example of the Accusative of Subordination without the **אֲתָה**, but the case cited from 1 Samuel is, I think, the only one in which an Accusative of Subordination with the particle is joined to the Nominative.

2. Those in which the Accusative of Subordination is joined to a preceding Accusative.*

1 Sam. 26:11, **קְח־נָא אֲתִ-הָנִית אֲשֶׁר מִרְאַשְׁתָּיו וְאֲתִ-צְפָּחַת**, "Take now the spear which is at his head, together with the cruse of water."

* Whether an Accusative joined to a preceding Accusative is subordinate or not, is a matter largely of interpretation.

וְהַמֶּלֶךְ שֶׁלְמָה אֶחָב נְשִׁים נְכָרִית רְכֻות וְאֶת-כְּתָה-פְּרֹעָה 1 Kgs. 11:1, “And King Solomon loved many strange wives, along with the daughter of Pharaoh.”

וְאֶת-הָאִישׁ וְאֶת-כָּל-מִשְׁפָחוֹת שֶׁלּוּ, “but the man together with all his family, they sent away.” Judg. 1:25,

אֶצְיָלָךְ וְאֶת הָעֵדָה זוֹאת, “I will deliver thee along with this city.” Isa. 38:6,

וְאֶת-צְדָקֵיהוּ... וְאֶת-שְׂרִיוֹ אֲתֶן בַּיד, “And Zedekiah together with his princes, I will give,” etc. Jer. 34:21,

4) With the Accusative depending upon a verb to be supplied. The construction is elliptical. The governing verb, however, can be supplied from the context. In Ps. 105:42 is the object of זָכַר to be supplied from the first member of the verse. Other examples of the same kind are to be found in Isa. 9:20 (**אֶת-כָּל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**) and Judg. 10:8 (**אֶת-מְנַשֶּׁה** and **אֶת-אַפְרִים**). An example of zeugma is found in 1 Sam. 1:21 where it is stated that Elkanah went up (to Shiloh) to sacrifice the sacrifice of days and *his-vow*. The latter, notwithstanding the fact that it is joined by the conjunction to the preceding Accusative, is to be taken as the object of a verb to be supplied, such as “to accomplish or perform.” But the most interesting example of the use of **אֶת** with an Accusative depending upon a verb to be supplied, is found in Ezek. 43:7 where is to be “to see or behold” to be supplied. The verb does not occur in the context; but the circumstances under which the words were spoken, the speaker’s tone and gesture, were sufficient to make his meaning plain and to indicate at the same time the verb to be understood before “the place of my throne,” etc.

5) With the Adverbial Accusative. Gen. 33:18, “and **וַיַּחַזֵּן אֶת-פָּנֵי הָעִיר**, “and he encamped before the city;” Deut. 1:22, “**אֶת-הַדְּرֵךְ**, “concerning the way;” Isa. 57:12, “And as for thy works (**וְאֶת-מְעַשֵּׂיךְ**)—they will not profit thee.”

Under the head of Adverbial Accusative, we may distinguish: (1) The Accusative of Time. This has reference to the *time in or during which* an act takes place. Thus in speaking of the festival of the passover, the J writer says **אֶת שְׁבַעַת הַיּוֹם**. But there are only a few examples of the use of **אֶת** with the Accusative of Time. Cf. Lev. 25:22; Deut. 9:25; Ps. 137:7; 2 Chron. 30:22.

(2) The Accusative of Place. This indicates the *locality towards which* an act tends or *in which* an act is performed. 1 Sam. 7:16, “And he judged Israel in all these places,” **אֶת כָּל-הַמִּקְמוֹת הָאֱלֹהִים**.

Judg. 19:18, “**וְאֶת בֵּית יְהוָה אֲנִי הַלֵּךְ**, “and to the house of Jehovah, I am going.”

Additional examples: Gen. 19:27; Ex. 34:23; Lev. 4:6; Deut. 16:16; 2 Sam. 15:23; Ps. 16:11; Esth. 1:10.

Remark A. **את** is used more frequently with the Accusative of Place than it is with the Accusative of Time.

(3) The Accusative of State or Condition. This Accusative occurs frequently in the Arabic. Without **את**, it is to be found several times in the Hebrew.* But with **את**, it occurs in only one place, i. e., Judg. 20:44, "And there fell.... eighteen thousand men, *all these being men of valor,*" **את-כל-אללה אֲנָשֵׁי חַיל'**.

(4) The Accusative of Specification. Of this Accusative with **את**, there is no difficulty in the finding of examples. 1 Kgs. 15:23, "He (Asa) was diseased *in his feet,*" **את-רגליו**; 1 Sam. 12:7, "that I may plead with you concerning all the righteous acts of J.," **את-כל-צדקות יְהוָה**; Ps. 78:8, "and its spirit was not steadfast *towards (in respect to)* God," **את-אל**. Additional examples are to be found in Gen. 17:11; Deut. 1:22; Ex. 1:14; Judg. 21:22; 1 Sam. 21:3; 2 Sam. 16:17; 1 Kgs. 8:15; Isa. 66:14; Ruth 2:11; 1 Chron. 21:6.

(5) The Accusative of Distinction. This accusative is used for the sake of emphasis or distinction. It is a kind of a Nominative Absolute, differing from the latter, however, in two particulars: 1) it is used only with the subject; and 2) it is never repeated. For an example, see Neh. 9:34, **וְאַתִּמְלַכֵּנוּ שְׁרִינוּ**, "as for our kings, our princes, our priests and our fathers—they have not kept the law." Other examples: 1) Jer. 45:4, **וְאַתְּכָלֵל הָאָרֶץ**, "And the whole earth—(that is) it (that I destroy);"; 2) Ezek. 35:10, **וְאַתִּשְׁנֵי**, "Because thou saidst, 'these two nations and these two lands—they shall be to me'"; 3) Jer. 28:28, **וְאַתִּהְכָּר**; 4) Ezek. 44:3, **וְאַתִּהְנַשֵּׁא**; 5) Zach. 8:17, **וְאַתִּקְרֹשֵׁין אֱלֹהָה**; 6) Num. 5:10, **וְאַתִּהְנַשֵּׁא**; 7) Isa. 57:12, **וְאַתִּמְעַשֵּׂךְ**.

(6) With the Accusative of Means or Instrument. In Mic. 3:8 the prophet speaks of himself as being full of power "by the spirit of Jehovah," **את-רוֹחַ יְהוָה**. In Ezek. 6:9 Jehovah is represented as being broken *by the whorish heart* of the people and *by their eyes* which were wont to go a-whoring after other gods, **את-לבָם הַזֹּנוֹה**.... **וְאַתִּעַנְהָם**. Another example is found in Judg. 8:7 where Gideon is represented as saying to the men of Succoth that after Jehovah had delivered into his power the two kings of Midian, he would tear their flesh (viz., the flesh of the men of Succoth) "with the thorns of the wilderness and with briers," **את-קִצֵּי הַמִּדְבָּר וְאַתִּהְבְּרִקְנִים**.

Remark A. In Gen. 49:25, **וְאַתִּשְׁדֵי** is in parallel construction with **מְאַל אֲבִיךָ**.

6) With the Accusative as the Object of a Passive Verb. 2 Kgs. 3:20, **וְתִמְלַא הָאָרֶץ אֶת-הַמִּים**, "And the land was filled with water;" and Ezek. 10:4, **וְיִמְלַא הַבַּיִת אֶת-הַעֲנָן**, "And the house was filled with smoke."

* Cf. Gen. 33:18, "And Jacob came *safe* (or *in safety*, **שָׁלֵם**) to the city of Shechem," and Amos 2:16, "*Naked* (**עָרֹם**) shall he flee on that day."

The explanation of this fact may be stated thus: When a verb which in a causative conjugation or even in the Qal governs two Accusatives becomes passive, it has the privilege of retaining one of the accusatives, viz., the second or more remote object.

7) With the Accusative as the Subject 1) of Passive Verbs; and 2) of Intransitive or Neuter Verbs.

(1) With the Accusative as the Subject of Passive Verbs. The use of **את** with the Accusative in this construction is very common: Gen. 4:18, יְוָלֵד ; Num. 14:21, וַיָּמָלֵא כָּבוֹד־יְהוָה אֶת־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ ; Jer. 38:4, לְחִנּוּךְ אֶת־עִירָּךְ ; Hos. 10:6, נִסְמָא אֲוֹתוֹ לְאַשּׁוֹר יָכֵל ; Prov. 16:33, בְּחִיקָּךְ יְוָמָת אֶת־הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה . This Accusative is the logical object of the verb; that is, if the verb were in the active voice, the word now in the accusative would be the object of the same. But the verb has become passive. And yet it retains its logical object, permitting the same to stand as its subject. This fact which is certainly puzzling can be explained only on the ground that a purely impersonal passive is inconceivable, that "in places where such an one seems to stand, a hidden agent must be supposed."

(2) With the Accusative as the subject of Intransitive or Neuter Verbs: Jer. 36:22, אֶת־כָּל־מִבְרָחוֹי , and Ezek. 17:21, וְאֶת־הָאָחָר לְפָנָיו מִבְעָרָת , and Dan. 9:13; Neh. 9:19; 2 Kgs. 6:5. The Accusative is, by analogy, used as the subject of an intransitive verb, for the latter, as Ewald has pointed out,* is a semi-passive.

Remark A. The use of **את** with an Accusative as the subject of an intransitive verb is not so common as its use with an Accusative as the subject of a passive verb.

את may, therefore, be used with 1) the Accusative of the Direct Object; 2) the Nominative Absolute; 3) the Accusative of Subordination; 4) the Accusative depending upon a verb to be supplied; 5) the Adverbial Accusative; 6) the Accusative as the object of a passive verb; and 7) the Accusative as the subject of (1) Passive verbs, and (2) Intransitive or Neuter verbs.

* Ewald's *Heb. Gram.*, translated by Nicholson, §248.

THE DESTRUCTION OF ANTIQUITIES IN THE EAST.

In a letter to the *Academy* (No. 930), dated Assouan, February 9, 1890, Professor Sayce calls attention to the destruction of antiquities in Egypt. About one or two years ago a society was formed to look after and protect these antiquities, and in order to raise funds and to limit the number of sightseers, a tax of 100 piastres was imposed on every person visiting the monuments of Upper Egypt. The object for which this society was organized has not been accomplished. Sayce claims that "more havoc has been wrought among them during the last three months than during the last half century. The famous tombs of Beni-Hassan have been hopelessly mutilated. The curious bas-reliefs of Tel el-Amarna have been hewn from the walls and the cartouches have been cut out of the tombs of the Sixth Dynasty at El-Bersheh. It is, however, in the well known "Tombs of the Colossus" and its immediate neighborhood that the hand of the destroyer has been most ruthless. The floor of the tomb is strewn with the fragments of the paintings and hieroglyphs with which its walls were once adorned. The hunting scene, carved in delicate relief on a stone at its entrance, and interesting on account of certain figures in it being drawn according to the modern rules of perspective, has been wantonly smashed to atoms. Even the tablet of Thothmes III. at the entrance of the quarries near the tombs has not been spared; it has been defaced beyond recognition. The work of destruction has been carried out in order to provide the dealers of Ekhmîm and Luxor with fragments of inscribed stone which they may sell to tourists." Sayce goes on to say that not only dealers but also the quarrymen are to blame for this destruction. The latter are now blasting at Assiout, Qars-el-Syâd, Gebel-el-Tük, etc. "It is evident that whatever inscriptions there are above ground in Egypt must be copied at once if they are to be copied at all." In the *Academy*, No 927, Lieut.-Col. Ross has a note on "The Mutilation of Monuments in Egypt," which corresponds very well to what Professor Sayce says.

The monuments and inscriptions in Assyria, Babylonia, and the Hittite country are sharing the same fate. At Carchemish (Jerâbis), the Arabs, because of their fanatical dislike to anything resembling an idol, have recently broken into fragments the large statue of black basalt with a female figure. Only four years ago Mr. Haynes saw this figure in perfect condition and photographed it, but in October, 1888, there was little or nothing of it left. Three other large statues at the same place have been broken in two and are now being used by the Arabs as millstones. In Babylonia the Arab dealers are digging at Jumjuma,

Birs-Nimrud, Tel-Ibrahim, Abû-Habba, etc. It was only a short time ago that they found at Jumjuma what Henri Pognon has described in the *Journal asiatique*, as Nebuchadrezzar's library. The Turkish authorities seized these finds, threw them into sacks, handling them as one would handle potatoes or corn, and they are now lying in a heap in the cellar of the Serai at Hilleh. There are many dealers in Baghdâd who own large collections of antiquities, excavated secretly by the Arab diggers. These collections are being scattered all over the world in small lots and in nine cases out of ten their owners do not know from what site they have been obtained.

At the present time, little is being done in the way of scientific excavation, and the prospect for the future is poor. The Turkish government, in the person of the director of the Stamboul Museum, has recently caught the scientific fever, and, as a result, a law has been passed that all the antiquities in the empire are the property of the sultan. Firmans to excavate are granted only on the condition, that the excavators be accompanied by a Turkish commissioner, whose salary they must pay, and to whom they must hand over all the antiquities found. Again the jealousy of the ambassadors of the principal powers at Constantinople has frustrated many attempts to obtain special and favorable firmans from the sultan. On account of the greed of the Turks and the jealousy of the powers, there is little encouragement to attempt further work in excavating these Assyrian, Babylonian and Hittite sites. Ambar and Abû-Habba have recently become the private property of the sultan, and hence firmans to excavate at these sites cannot be obtained on any conditions. The Arabs, however, will continue to excavate secretly and to break, destroy and promiscuously scatter their finds. Unless these mounds can be excavated scientifically and by persons anxious to preserve every relic found, it would be much better to have them remain untouched.

ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER,

Yale University.

⇒BOOK & NOTICES.⇐

GREEN'S HEBREW GRAMMAR.*

For nearly a generation Professor Green's larger Hebrew Grammar and the translations of Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar have been those upon which the majority of American students have been obliged to depend for their more full information concerning the facts and principles of Hebrew grammar. Of these two, that of Prof. Green made the better presentation of the facts of Orthography and Etymology. Some points of superiority most noteworthy were the statements of the varying uses of Dāghēš-forte, of the facts concerning the prose accents, the many lists, such as of the middle E verbs and the like, and of nouns giving the phenomena in respect to gender and plural forms, in addition were the copious summaries of the forms of verbs and nouns which deviate from the normal types of inflection. Prof. Green, among grammarians this side of the ocean, made innovations in the classification of vowels and in the formation of nouns. Long after the publication of his grammar an illogical and inconvenient theory of noun-formation remained in Gesenius' grammar. Now the three classes of vowels and the principles of noun formation which were adopted so long ago by Prof. Green are generally accepted. The excellences already named and others had made the previous editions of Prof. Green's Hebrew Grammar the nearest approach to a thesaurus of Orthography and Etymology which was available to the majority of American students. To illustrate from Deut. 32: the construct participle אָכֵד v. 28, and the Hithp. חִנְחָם^{חִנְחָם} of v. 33, were noted in Green and not in Gesenius. This edition adds the form שִׁנְחָם^{שִׁנְחָם} in v. 18. One felicity in the arrangement of the grammar was in placing matter which pertained to the signification of nouns as indicated by gender and number under the head of Etymology where it belonged, instead of in the Syntax, as is done in Gesenius.

When it was announced that the veteran scholar and teacher was issuing a new and thoroughly revised edition of his grammar, students and scholars who already owed him much were ready to welcome the new volume. There is so much change that the author should be allowed to speak for himself in the preface:

* A GRAMMAR OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE. By William Henry Green, Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J. New edition, carefully revised throughout and the syntax greatly enlarged. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Publishers. 1889.

"Twenty-seven years, which have elapsed since the first publication of this Grammar, have been exceedingly fruitful in the philological and exegetical study of the Old Testament, and important progress has been made toward a more thorough and accurate knowledge of the grammatical structure of the Hebrew language. This edition of the Grammar has been carefully revised throughout that it may better represent the advanced state of scholarship on this subject. Nearly every page exhibits corrections or additions of greater or less consequence. And the Syntax particularly, which was not fully elaborated before, has been greatly enlarged, and for the most part entirely rewritten. The plan of the Grammar, the method of treatment, and in general the order of the sections are unchanged. And little occasion has been found to alter the more general and comprehensive statements, which are distinguished by being printed in large type. The changes are chiefly in the addition of fuller details enlarging and multiplying the paragraphs in small type.

"The principle of eschewing all supposititious forms and adducing none but such as really occur in the Old Testament, has been steadily adhered to as heretofore, with the view of rigorously conforming all rules and examples to the actual phenomena of the language. The text of Baer is preferred so far as published, the disputed orthophonic Daghesh-forte excepted, though it is recognized and its rules are stated. In the discussion of the poetic accents free use has been made of the elaborate treatises of Baer and Wickes; and the names which they employ are given as well as those which previously were more familiar. The intricate rules for the employment of Methegh are also drawn from Baer.

"The convenience of students has been consulted in removing the paradigms of pronouns, verbs and nouns from the body of the volume and placing them together at the end. A new paradigm has been introduced, affording a succinct view of the formation of nouns of different classes, with their respective significations. The declensions of nouns have been simplified by an arrangement which corresponds at once with their etymological structure and with the vowel changes to which they are severally liable. While every part of the Syntax is much more fully developed than before, special attention has been paid to the use of the tenses, which is so thoroughly discussed in the admirable treatise of Dr. Driver. The old names preterite and future are for the reasons on pp. 299-302, preferred to perfect and imperfect, which are now so generally adopted; but the latter are used in conjunction with the former for the convenience of those who like them better. The various kinds of compound sentences, involving relative, conditional, circumstantial, and co-ordinate clauses, receive the attention which is due to their peculiar character and separate importance. The different rules and statements of the Grammar, and particularly of the Syntax, are illustrated and confirmed by a copious citation of passages in which they are exemplified. Full indexes, as before, accompany the Grammar to facilitate its use."

After reading this preface, one is prepared to find great improvement, and he is not disappointed in this. In the mechanical execution one notes at once the use of larger type, both English and Hebrew, which is more conspicuous and pleasing to the eye, also such accuracy that errata are rare. There is such rearrangement of matter that, after section 141, references to former editions will no longer serve. The great changes in matter concern the poetic accents and the

syntax. Among minor changes are such as giving W and Wāw as the alternatives to V and Vāv in the alphabet; such enlarged rules concerning Méthégh (better than even in Gesenius, Aufl. 25); giving the form of the tetragrammaton as יהוה' and omitting all alternative forms; an omission of a phrase assigning the authorship of Ecclesiastes to Solomon; and numerous additional forms of verbs and nouns under the various heads of inflection. Also is noticeable the substitution of "Vāv Consecutive" for "Vāv Conversive." All these changes are certainly improvements.

The 46 pages formerly given to Syntax have become 126. This increase appears partly in subjects not formerly treated, e. g., § 246, Personal Pronoun as Subject; § 262, Predicate Noun; § 275, Principal tenses with Vāv Consecutive; §§ 303–308, Hypothetical Sentences; § 309, Circumstantial Sentences. More space is given to almost every subject formerly treated, the Article and the Construct State (even in the previous editions discussed more satisfactorily than in Gesenius) receive nearly double their former space. Most subjects receive still greater additions, e. g., in place of a half page formerly given to Modal Forms there are now six and a half pages.

As a whole this grammar must be considered decidedly better as a book of reference than the edition of Gesenius now current in English. In those respects in which the previous editions of this grammar were pre-eminent this edition is still more so, and it has added the treatment of the poetic accents. In the syntax the points of superiority are the entire treatment of the Subject, of the Modal Forms, Interrogative, Relative and Hypothetical Sentences and Vāv together with the Circumstantial Sentence not mentioned in Gesenius. Also in many details may this excellence be seen. It alone or almost alone among grammars illustrates at length the difference between the Paragogic or Emphatic Imperative and the common forms, § 272-b. The facts noted in § 258–3–6 are correctly stated in no other grammar at hand. In § 279b is noted the strange use of ינּוּ with the Imperfect in Deut. 33:11.

With full recognition of the excellence of former editions of this grammar it must be said that it is doubtful whether the Syntax of the first edition was as good as that of Nordheimer published twenty years before that. As a whole the Syntax seemed inadequate when compared with that of the Gesenius of the same date. It seems, too, as though the twenty-seven years which intervened between the first edition and the present one should have seen greater improvements. The four years between the 24th and 25th editions of Gesenius (i. e., the German editions) have witnessed even a more complete revolutionizing of that grammar, and probably as great an increase in matter. There has been ample opportunity to gather such material, for there have long been published such features of syntax as the Nominal Sentence, the Casus Pendens, some features of which are called Compound Sentences by Mueller, the various

uses of **את-**, and many details, such as the use of **הַרְבָּה** in Isa. 30:33, noted by Ewald.

Not alone in the Syntax is there a failure to garner the results of research. The sections on the vowels seem like a photograph of the phenomena; yet can they be called a satisfactory statement of the facts? The vowel S'ghôl is always called a vowel of the I-class. S'ghôl is sometimes an intermediate between Pâthâh and Qâmèç just as Hîrëq is an intermediate between Pâthâh and Çérê. Is it likely that in these two cases S'ghôl and Hîrëq are vowels of the same class? Again, is it likely that the S'ghôl of **סֹסִיךְ** is of the same nature as that in **את-**? Again, the forms **יקום** and **נקום** are derived from **יקום** with the statement that they take "the simplest of the long vowels ā." Is this an adequate explanation? Again the explanation given respecting the penult vowels in **הַקְטָל**, **הַקְטִיל**, **קְטָל**, **קְטִיל** is "The absolute infinitive is formed by changing the last vowel in Hiph'il and Hoph'al to Cere, and in each of the other species to Holem, observing likewise that Hireq in the penult of Pi'el and Hiph'il is to be changed to Pathah." The theory of the development of vowels given in Bickell's *Outlines to Hebrew Grammar* seems confirmed by a careful study of the phenomena in question and comparison with cognate languages; it provides a rational explanation of the inflection of the verb. Would it not have been a great improvement over the scheme presented in this grammar?

Prof. Green's argument against the terms perfect and imperfect to designate the tenses is by no means without weight, yet the argument for the terms preterite and future does not seem as weighty: if *a priori* considerations are in order, should it not be said that the idea of time requires more maturity in thinking than the idea of kind of action. It now seems that the inappropriateness of the terms preterite and future has been fairly proved, although the terms perfect and imperfect do not yet seem to be fully vindicated. The little evidence which is presented in favor of the opinion that preterite and future are adequate is perhaps due to a historical development in the direction of such ideas.

Notwithstanding all these criticisms, it can be justly claimed that this edition of Prof. Green's Hebrew Grammar is the most serviceable book for reference now in English. For class-room use it is less valuable. Clear statement is the rule in it as it is not in Gesenius' grammar, but the mechanical structure is poorly adapted to class-room use. Under the head "Object of Verbs," § 284-a, is a remark on the order of words which contains nineteen references or groups of illustrations. Suppose a teacher have the twelfth specification in mind and give this reference to the student to look up. What likelihood is there that the student will find what he needs, unless he spends more time than he ought to be asked to do? In order to have been properly serviceable that remark should have been made into a full section with several subdivisions. Its appropriate place is under the head of "The Sentence." While this is an extreme illustration, it is

but one of many of the same kind. The time allowed to the study of Hebrew is now so scanty that all helps in the saving of time are imperatively needed. Instead of having text-books less adapted to the purpose than are those in Latin and Greek, the student of Hebrew should have text-books better adapted, if possible. The more direct the path is to the information needed, the more can be accomplished in the time allowed, and the better power of syntactical discrimination will be gained. On account of these considerations many teachers would be wholly unwilling to use this grammar in the class-room. It is to be hoped that when the latest edition of Gesenius is translated some liberties will be taken with the structure to adapt it to the needs here indicated.

The desire to have a grammar which will meet all the needs of the student in the class-room and yet be adequate to the needs of the advanced student is not unreasonable, nor is its gratification impracticable. Some of the grammars of the classic languages are ample proof of the statement just made.

There are other needs of the student which are not met by this grammar. A deficiency which appears at the first page is a lack of an account of the Hebrew and allied languages, and the literature in the Hebrew, together with some suggestions respecting the Aramaic found in the Old Testament. Students desire such information, often have nothing else in which to seek it, and are sometimes stimulated by having their horizon thus broadened.

Students also need to find a Syntax constructed on the principle of presenting and emphasizing those features of Syntax which are peculiar to Hebrew. First they need to find a general presentation of the sentence as a whole. This is Syntax in the "narrower sense" as Kautzsch calls it. By a few paragraphs on this subject, Prof. Green has made his grammar conspicuous among Hebrew grammars; Ewald and Nordheimer are almost his only companions in so doing. These few sentences need to be greatly enlarged so as to give a full discussion of the simple sentence as such. There is a logical reason for such an arrangement of material, aside from the desirability of beginning the discussion of syntax with the subject in the narrower sense and then broadening out into the wider discussion. The reason lies in the very nature of discourse. As a judgment is the unit of thought, so a sentence as a whole is the unit of discourse, because the sentence is but the expression of a judgment. This is confirmed by the fact that at the outset students translate a sentence as a whole, rather than deal with the words as separate elements. To treat of the multiplicity of the parts before treating of the whole is certainly illogical. In addition to these considerations must be noted the fact that the Hebrew sentence has peculiarities of its own which differentiate it from the Greek or Latin sentence. The very fact that a student has an acquaintance with these languages is an additional reason for putting the characteristic differences in the foreground.

The second subject to be taken up would necessarily be the predicate and the modes in which it is expressed. In this respect Mueller and Gesenius Aufl. 25 have done what is right, only they would have more accurately expressed the fact if they had taken the heading "The Predicate" instead of "The Verb." Here is a point where the Hebrew grammar ought to vary from the classic grammars, for the predicate is the more emphatic part of the sentence. The third general head should be "The Subject," and the fourth, "The Compound Sentence."

Finally the student needs a complete index of Hebrew words. The promise of the preface of this grammar is not fully kept. The index of Hebrew words which had been so excellent a feature of the preceding edition is omitted. Would it not have been more valuable than the index of Scripture references? It is little wonder that in years past students, who had been enthusiastic over Greek or Latin, were disgusted with Hebrew when they attempted to use their grammars as they had been accustomed to use their Greek and Latin grammars. No book needs thorough indexing so much as a grammar of a foreign language. A list of Hebrew words with references is better than nothing though it is far from adequate. Out of nearly a score of grammars (partial or complete) which are at hand, but three can claim to be properly indexed in this respect: Driver's *Hebrew Tenses*, Harper's *Elements of Hebrew* (the Etymology), and best of all Mueller's *Hebrew Syntax*. If a writer or translator of a Hebrew Grammar has any desire to make his work approach its possibilities of usefulness (to say nothing of making the use a pleasure to the user) let him take Mueller's *Hebrew Syntax* or almost any Greek grammar as a model, and index his book accordingly. If the book is not worth indexing in this manner it is not worth writing or translating.

F. B. DENIO,
Bangor, Me.

WORKMAN'S JEREMIAH.*

It is the most natural thing in the world that a work of this kind and character should attract the attention of Old Testament specialists to a more than ordinary degree. Its theme is one of the most vexing and perplexing problems in that great and unsolved enigma, the textual criticism of the Jewish Scriptures. From another point of view the work has also a representative as well as an individual importance, namely, as indication of the new ideas and ideals of the modern biblical scholarship of America, which is no longer content with reproduc-

* THE TEXT OF JEREMIAH; or, A Critical Investigation of the Greek and Hebrew, with the variations in the LXX., retranslated into the original and explained. By the Rev. George Coulson Workman, M. A., Professor of Old Testament Exegesis and Literature in Victoria University, Cobourg, Ont., Canada. With Introductory Notice by Professor Franz Delitzsch, D. D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George street, 1889. Pp. XLIV. 398, 8vo.

tion and compilation but by independent research in new fields is contributing its share towards the solution of the many Bible problems yet awaiting investigation.

The work aims, by a comparison between the Septuagint and the Massoretic texts of Jeremiah, to determine the relative value of each and their relations to each other. The manner of procedure consists in a renewed investigation of the many marked divergencies between the Greek and the Hebrew, taking, in order, the omissions, the additions, the transpositions, the alterations, the substitutions found in the texts, followed by one chapter on the origin of the variations, one on the character of the translation, and one on the results of the investigation. The last and intrinsically most valuable chapter is a conspectus of variations, based upon a retranslation of the Septuagint into its original Hebrew. The preliminary detail in these chapters contains much of interest and value, although also not a little that is problematical and doubtful, and some that is certainly incorrect. The leading trouble is here, as elsewhere, a weakness in the method which damages its strictly scientific character, namely, a too great tendency to draw conclusions from insufficient data. The author is evidently not willing to make haste slowly in claiming evidence and proof for propositions. As a result his principal conclusion, namely, the great superiority of the Septuagint over the Hebrew texts of Jeremiah, if correct at all, cannot be said to have been proved correct by the data presented in this work. This tendency of Workman to deal with matters still problematical and uncertain and to draw from these his deductions, seems to me to be the cardinal defect of his whole manner and method. We have seldom, if ever, read a scientific work which contains such an abundance of expressions of doubt, uncertainty, and hesitancy as this. So much is this the case, that, notwithstanding his willingness to make these data do their full duty and even more, their influence is acknowledged to a most remarkable degree by the author himself in his summary of conclusion (p. 280 sqq.). The unsteady foundation of a necessity made the superstructure extremely unsteady too. In his first conclusion there is a "appears to have existed;" in his second, a "possibly" and "may be" (*bis*); in his third (in which what is left doubtful in the second is evidently accepted as demonstrated), there is a "may have been;" in the fourth, there is a "as nearly as can be determined;" in the sixth a "seems to have been," and an "apparently;" and so on. A neat chrestomathy of sentences of this kind in rapid and close connections can be found in almost any part of the book, cf. e. g., p. 233 sq.

It would not be a difficult task to point out other defects of the work, and this has been done elsewhere. Yet notwithstanding all these the book deserves a warm welcome, not on account of the results which it offers, but as a faithful and patient collection of materials on a difficult Old Testament problem. The data, it is true, must be re-examined more leisurely and with greater care; but

for the data themselves we have all reason to feel grateful. While as a scientific work it cannot bear a comparison with similar works of Wellhausen and Cornill, and not even of Ryssel, and while it has not solved the problem it investigates, it certainly has done much toward this solution.

GEORGE H. SCHODDE,
Capital University, Columbus, O.

SAYCE'S RECORDS OF THE PAST, VOLS. I. AND II.*

The new edition of the *Records of the Past* seems to follow too closely the old edition edited by Birch. The texts are inserted promiscuously without regard to order, linguistic or chronological. One finds Assyrian, Babylonian, Vannic, Egyptian, etc., following one another in quite a confused manner. There are very few philological notes; the plan of the book dispenses with transliterations. It would have been more satisfactory if the arrangement had followed as closely as possible the chronological order of the material and had separated the Assyro-Babylonian from the Egyptian, placing the miscellaneous material, e. g., the Akkadian, Vannic, Moabite Stone, etc., in a single volume by itself. It is also to be regretted that the transliterations of the different texts have not been added, if only in nonpareil type at the foot of each page (in order to save space and not to make the volumes too bulky) so that students might have used this series as convenient hand-books. While Schrader's *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* is to be preferred on account of its transliterations and the chronological arrangement of the texts, it is nevertheless far behind the *RP.* in the matter of introductions to the texts translated, bibliographical and geographical notes, some of the latter being very exhaustive and of great value.

In Vol. I. Prof. Sayce translates the "Dynastic Tablets and Chronicles of the Babylonians." He reckons six of these, and No. 4 is the lately discovered Baby-

* RECORDS OF THE PAST, being English Translations of the Ancient Monuments of Egypt and Western Asia. New series. Edited by A. H. Sayce. London: *Samuel Bagster & Sons*.

Contents of Volume I.: 1. The Dynastic Tablets and Chronicles of the Babylonians, 1-41, by Sayce. 2. The Inscriptions of Teloh, 42-77, by Arthur Amiaud. 3. Sin-Ghasid's Endowment of the Temple E-Ana, 78-83, by T. G. Pinches. 4. An Erechite's Lament, 84-85, by T. G. Pinches. 5. Inscription of Tiglath-pileser I., 86-121, by Sayce. 6. The Assyrian Story of the Creation, 122-146, by Sayce. 7. The Babylonian Story of the Creation according to the Tradition of Cutha, 147-153, by Sayce. 8. Babylonian Lawsuits and Judgments, 154-162, by J. Oppert. 9. Inscription of Menuas, King of Ararat, in the Vannic Language, 163-167, by Sayce. 10. The Ancient Hebrew Inscription of Siloam, 168-175, by Sayce.

Contents of Volume II.: 1. Inscription of Uni (of Sixth Dynasty), 1-10, by Maspero. 2. The Adventures of Sinuhit (of 12th Dynasty), 11-36, by Maspero. 3. The Legend of the expulsion of the Hyksos, 37-44, by Maspero. 4. The Stele of Thothmes IV. (of 18th Dynasty), 45-56, by D. Mallet. 5. Tablets of Tel el-Amarna relating to Palestine in the Century before the Exodus, 57-71, by Sayce. 6. Inscriptions of Teloh, 72-109, by Arthur Amiaud. 7. The Assyrian Chronological Canon, 110-127, by Sayce. 8. The Standard Inscription of Assurnatsirpal, 128-177, by Sayce. 9. Specimens of Assyrian Correspondence, 178-189, by T. G. Pinches. 10. Akkadian Hymn to the Setting Sun, 190-193, by G. Bertin. 11. The Moabite Stone, 194-203, by A. Neubauer.

Ionian Chronicle. Prof. Sayce, for the first time, has put this chronicle in convenient form for English readers, Pinches' translation not being easily accessible. The inscriptions of Telloh are translated by Arthur Amiaud, the first scholar in this line of investigation and whose early death was a very serious blow to Assyriology. Amiaud's introduction is very interesting. He discusses 1st the site Telloh, and identifies it with Shirpurla. Shirpurla, however, is to be taken as a general name of a great centre of population of which Girsu, Uru-azagga, Ninâ, and Gishgalla are only divisions or quarters. 2d. The Dynasties of Telloh, i. e., the kings (four or five in number) and the Patesis (eight). 3d. The campaign of Gudea in Elam, and 4th, The Pantheon of Telloh. Nirgirsu was the supreme god and in addition each prince was accustomed to select an additional deity to intercede for him with Nirgirsu.

In Vol. II., Prof. Sayce translates some of the Tel el-Amarna inscriptions, being selections from those which appeared in the *PSBA.*, Vol. IX.* Many of his readings must be regarded as provisional, and some of them will, doubtless, be given up when the el-Amarna tablets have been more thoroughly studied. The editor has also translated the "Assyrian Canon and Chronicle." It would have been better if this material had followed the "Dynastic Tablets" in I. Pinches in his specimens of Assyrian correspondence adds to the translation the ever welcome transliteration and philological notes. Neubauer translates the Moabite Stone and gives a fairly exhaustive bibliography of the subject.

These books will be of great value to students who are not acquainted with the Assyro-Babylonian and the Egyptian. They must not be regarded as the final presentation on the subjects of which they treat. Some of the texts translated are exceedingly difficult, e. g., the Creation and El-Amarna tablets, and many years will pass by before what may be called a final translation can be offered.

Perhaps a good reason existed for the lack of order in these volumes, viz., that some of the material is new and important and hence the publication should not be delayed for years until its place is reached in the series.

ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER,
Yale University.

* Cf. *HEBRAICA*, October 1889, p. 73.

CONTENTS OF JOURNALS.

Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology (Vol. XII., 3 and 4).

- ROBERT BROWN, JR., Remarks on the Tablet of the Thirty Stars (Part I.), 137-152.
E. DE BUNSEN, The Pharaohs of Moses according to Hebrew and Egyptian Chronology, 157-166.
A. L. LEWIS, Some Suggestions respecting the Exodus, 167-179.
- ROBERT BROWN, JR., Remarks on the Tablet of Thirty Stars (Part II.), 180-206.
C. J. BALL, The New Accadian (Part III.), 207-222.

Babylonian and Oriental Record (Vol. IV., No. 2).

- THEO. G. PINCHES, A Babylonian Duplicate of Tablets I. and II. of the Creation Series, 25-33.
- W. ST. CHAD BOSCAWEN, The Babylonian and Jewish Festivals, 34-38.
V. SCHEIL, Assyriological Notes, 44-48.

Zeitschrift für die Assyriologie (Vol. IV., No. 4).

- JASTROW, MORRIS, JR., A Cylinder of Marduk-tabikzirim, 301-323.
SCHEIL, FR. V., Inscription de Nabû-abil-iddin, 324-344.
WINCKLER, HUGO, Noch einiges über die Chaldaer, 345-360.
PEISER, F. E., Eine babylonische Landkarte, 361-370.
OPPERT, J., Les Signes numériques des mesures babylonniennes de capacité, 371-373.
BARTH, J., Spuren des *na*-präfixes im Arabischen, 374-381.
SAYCE, A. H., Miscellaneous Notes: 24. The Language of *Su*. 25. The Origin of the Name Armenia. 26. A Hittite(?) word for fortress. 27. Asipu and Joseph. 28. Xisuthros. 29. Khandal or Khandila "trunk." 30. The Accadian *sebi* "clothing." 31. *Ursanu a* "hero." 32. Genesis XIV. 1-11. 33. The Name of Eve in Assyrian, 382-393.
ZIMMERN, H., Ein ergänzendes Duplikat zu S* VI. 1-13, 394,295.
TELONI, B., Brief an C. Bezold, 396.
OPPERT, J., Note supplémentaire sur les dates arsaciades, 397-399.
— U-AN-TIM et U-AN-TAM, 400-450.
WINCKLER, HUGO, Brief an C. Bezold, 403-405.
— Bemerkung zu den el-Amarna-Briefen, 404,405.
— Eine neu veröffentlichte Inschrift eines unbekannten Königs, 406.
JASTROW, MORRIS, Épêšu, 406-408.
PEISER, F. E., Critique of Winckler's Keilschrifttexte Sargons, 409-415.
TIELE, C. P., Critique of Winckler's Untersuchungen zur altorientalischen Geschichte, 415-427.
BEZOLD, C., Critique of Brünnow's Classified List of all simple and compound cuneiform Ideographs, etc., II. and III., 427-440.

♦SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY.♦

- AMIAUD, ARTHUR. Les nombres ordinaux en assyrien. *Journ. asiatique*, XIII. 3.
- AURES, A. Études de la formation des mesures assyriennes de capacité. *Rec. de trav.*, XI., 1-2.
- BACON, B. W. Critique of Westphal's *Les Sources du Pentateuque*. I. Le problème littéraire. *Andover Review*, Mar., 1890.
- BALL, C. J. The New Accadian. Part III. *PSBA.*, Vol. XII., Part 4, 1890.
- BARTH, J. Spuren des *na*-Präfixes im Arabischen. *ZA.*, IV., 4.
— Critique of Socin's *Arabische Grammatik*. *Deut. Ltztn.*, XI., 9, 1890.
- BERTIN, G. L'ordre syntactique en Suméro-accadien. *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie orientale*. II., 2, 1889.
- BEZOLD, C. Critique of Brünnow's Classified List of all simple and compound cuneiform ideographs, etc. *ZA.*, IV., 4.
— Critique of Winckler's *Untersuchungen zur altorientalischen Geschichte*. *Trübner's Record*, No. 248.
- BOSCAWEN, W. ST. CHAD. The Babylonian and Jewish Festivals. *BOR.*, IV., 2.
- BRIGGS, C. A. Critique of Baudissin's Die Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Priesterthums. *Andover Review*, Mar., 1890.
- BROWN, ROBERT. Remarks on the Tablet of the Thirty Stars. (Part II.) *PSBA.*, Vol. XII., Part 4, 1890.
- CAZET, CL. Généalogie des racines sémitiques. Paris: *Maisonneuve*, pp. VII. 243. 8vo.....fr.6.
- CHEYNE, T. K. Critique of Wildeboer's *Het ontstaan van den Kanon des Ouden Verbonds*. *Academy*, No. 925.
- DE BUNSEN, E. The Pharaoh's of Moses according to Hebrew and Egyptian Chronology. *PSBA.*, Vol. XII., Part 4, 1890.
- DELITZSCH (FRIEDRICH) on the Assyrian. *Independent*, Mar. 6, 1890.
- DRIVER, S. R. Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel. With an Introduction on Hebrew Palaeography and the Ancient Versions and Fac-similes of Inscriptions. Oxford: *Clarendon Press*. 1890.
- JASTROW, JR., MORRIS. A Cylinder of Marduktabikzirim. *ZA.*, IV., 4.
— ^ÂEpêšu. *Ibid.*
- KRUEGER, G. Critique of Amiaud's La légende syriaque de Saint Alexis. *Theol. Ltztn.*, XV. No. 5.

- LEHMANN, C. F. Altbabylonisches Maass und Gewicht und deren Wanderung.
Verhandl. d. Berl. Anthropol. Gesellschaft, 1890.
- LEWIS, A. L. Some Suggestions concerning the Exodus. *PSBA.*, Vol. XII., Part 4, 1890.
- MAHLER, EDWARD. Le rapport entre Sab'e siltanu mât Muṣiri et Pir'u šar mât Muṣuri. *Journ. asiatique*, XIII., 3.
- MOORE, G. W. Critique of Socin's Arabische Grammatik. *Andover Review*, Mar., 1890.
- MUELLER, A. Critique of Halfman's Beiträge zur Syntax der Hebräischen Sprache. *Deut. Ltzng.*, XI., 7, 1890.
- MUELLER, FRIEDRICH. Beiträge zur Erklärung der altpersischen Keilinschriften. *Weiner Zeitschrift f. d. Kunde des Morgenlandes*, III.
- NÖLDEKE, TH. Critique of Snouck's Bilder aus Mekka. *Trübner's Record*, No. 248.
- OPPERT, J. Les signes numériques des mesures babylonniennes de capacité. *ZA.*, IV., 4.
- U-AN-TIM et U-AN-TAM. *Ibid.*
- Note supplémentaire sur les dates arsacides. *Ibid.*
- Note sur les mesures chaldéennes de superficie. *C—r. de l'acad. des inscr.* XVII.
- PEISER, F. E. Eine babylonische Landkarte. *ZA.*, IV. 4.
- Critique of Winckler's Keilschrifttexte Sargons. *Ibid.*
- PINCHES, THEO. G. A Babylonian Duplicate of Tablets I. and II. of the Creation Series. *BOR.*, IV., 2.
- Branding Animals in Ancient Babylonia. *Independent*, Mar., 13, 1890.
- RUGARLI, V. Tre iscrizioni cuneiformi di Dario d'Istaspe su la rupe de Behistan. Tradotta dal persico. Bologna: *Zamorani*, 1889.
- Critique of Salmone's Arabic-English Dictionary. *Athenæum*, No. 3255.
- SAYCE, A. H. Miscellaneous Notes: 24. The Land of Su. 25. The Origin of the name Armenia. 26. A Hittite(?) Word for Fortress. 27. Asipu and Joseph. 28. Xisuthros. 29. Khandal or Khandil "a trunk." 30. The Accadian sebi "clothing." 31. Ursanu "a hero." 32. Genesis XIV. 1-11. 33. The name Eve in Assyrian. *ZA.*, IV., 4.
- The Language of Mitanni. *Academy*, No. 925.
- Letter from Egypt. *Academy*, No. 933.
- SCHEIL, FR. V. Inscription de Nabû-abil-iddin. *ZA.*, IV., 4.
- Assyriological Notes. *BOR.*, IV., 2.
- STEINSCHNEIDER, M. Critique of Bacher's Aus der Schrifterklärung des Abul-walid Merwân ibn Ganâh. *Deut. Ltzng.*, XI. 10. 1890.
- STRASSMAIER, J. N. Babylonische Texte. Heft VII. Inschriften von Cyrus, König von Babylon (538-529 V. Chr.) von den Thontafeln des Britischen

- Museums copiert und autographirt. Enthaltend 384 Inschriften mit 5 Registern. Leipzig: *Eduard Pfeiffer*, 1890. 8vo, pp. 324.....M.20.
- TELONI, B. Un' inscrizione di Neriglassar transcritta tradotta e commentata. *Giorn. della Societá Asiat. Ital.* III. 1889.
- Brief an C. Bezold. *ZA.*, IV., 4.
- THAYER, T. H. Critique of Schürer's Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi. *Andover Review*, Mar. 1890.
- TIELE, C. P. Critique of Winckler's Untersuchungen zur altorientalischen Geschichte. *ZA.*, IV., 4.
- WALTHER, J. Les découvertes de Ninive et de Babylone au point de vue biblique. Conférences. Lausanne: *Georges Bridel*. 1889, pp. 129 avec 25 fig.fr.4.
- WINCKLER, HUGO. Noch einiges über die Chaldäer. *ZA.*, IV., 4.
- Brief an C. Bezold. *Ibid.*
- Bemerkung zu den El-Amarna Briefen. *Ibid.*
- Eine neu veröffentlichte Inschrift eines unbekannten Königs. *Ibid.*
- ZIMMERN, H. Ein ergänzendes Duplikat zu S^a VI., 1-13. *ZA.*, IV., 4.

FRANZ DELITZSCH was born in Leipzig, February 23, 1813. In 1842 he "habilitated" in Leipzig with a dissertation on the prophet Habakkuk, afterwards published in book-form under the title *Der Prophet Habakkuk*. In 1846, he became professor in Rostock, in 1850 in Erlangen, and in 1867, in Leipzig. In 1860 appeared his commentary on the *Psalms*; in 1872, his *Proverbs*; in 1875, his *Solomon's Song and Ecclesiastes*; in 1886, his *Isaiah*, and in 1887, the last edition of his *Genesis*. In 1863, while professor at Erlangen, he founded *Saat auf Hoffnung*, a journal devoted to Jewish Missions. His translation of the New Testament into Hebrew first appeared in 1877, and since that date has passed through several editions. While professor at Leipzig, he conducted a very popular and interesting Seminar for English and American students. After a short illness, Professor Delitzsch died in Leipzig, March 3d, 1890.

ANDREAS HEINRICH THORBECKE was born at Meiningen on March 13th, 1837. He became Docent in Heidelberg in 1868, and in 1873 he was made professor extraordinarius. In 1885 he was called to Halle, where in 1888 he was made professor ordinarius. His chief works are "Antarah, ein vorislamischer Dichter;" "Hariri's Durrat al-Ghawwáss" (1871); "Al-A'sha's poem in praise of Mohammed" (1875); a portion of the "Annals of Tabari" (Ser. II., pp. 1-295, 1881); "Ibn Duraid's Kitáb al-Maláhin" (1882), and the first volume of "Mufaddhalíyát" (1885). He died in Mannheim on January 3, 1890.
